Foreign and American Dealers in
Rare Books, Autographs, Manuscripts, Prints, Engravings, etc.

JUST PUBLISHED
CATALOGUE 64:
AN EXTENSIVE COLLECTION OF
BOOKS ON THE FINE ARTS
EARLY PRINTED WORKS
FROM THE
FAIRFAX MURRAY COLLECTION
French Illustrated Books of the 18th Century
FINE OLD BINDINGS
Association Volumes of Dickens
A REMARKABLE COLLECTION OF
BOOKSELLERS' TRADE CARDS
MEZZOTINT PORTRAITS
AUTOGRAPH LETTERS, ETC., ETC.
POST-FREE FROM
HENRY SOTHERAN & CO.
43, Piccadilly, W. 1, London, Eng.
OR 140, STRAND, W. C. 2.

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES TO BE HAD at ABRAHAM'S BOOK STORE, 145 4th Avenue.

ANTIQUARIAN BOOK CO.
Evesham Road, Stratford-on-Avon, England
Dealers in Rare Books and First Editions: Dickens, Thackeray, Stevenson, Kipling, Conrad, Masefield, Wells, Noyes, Dunsany, etc., etc.
Catalogues mailed free on request.

BOOKS! Over 1,000,000 volumes on every conceivable subject, second-hand, at half prices; new books at discount prices; catalogues free. One of the finest stocks of Rare Books and First Editions. State wants. Books bought.—W. and G. FOYLE, 121-123 Charing Cross Road, London, Eng.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.

The Nation
FOUNDED 1865
Published Saturdays.
Owned by THE NATION PRESS, INC.
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President.
B. W. TOMLINSON, Sec'y and Treas.

Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1887, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR.
HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, MANAGING EDITOR.
WILLIAM MACDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, ASSOCIATE EDITORS.
HARRY WILDE HARRIS, BUSINESS MANAGER.
MIRIAM R. WALTER, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, $5.00.

Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.
Cable Address: VILLARD, NEW YORK.

Washington Office: 647 Munsey Building;
Chicago Office: People's Gas Building.

The Nation

Contents of this Number

THE WEEK 357

EDITORIAL ARTICLES:
Clearing Skies and a Trumpet Call 360
The European Coal Crisis 361
An Humble Inquiry 362
A Gasless-Sunday Reverie 362
The Undertakers' Friend 363

THE NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE IN POLITICS. By Frank G. Moorhead 364

THE RANGE OF FRENCH ROMANTICISM. By E. Preston Dargan 366

HOW IS A WAR LOAN SPENT? By George A. Schreiner 368

IDLE WATERWAYS. By Albert Jay Nock ... 369

INTERNATIONAL MINDEDNESS 370

A VISION. By Willis Boyd Allen..... 371

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:
The Voice of Japanese Democracy. By Ernest W. Clement 371

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By The Drifter..... 372

CORRESPONDENCE:
Radicalism and American Labor. By Victor S. Yarros 373
English Food Control Again. By Vernon Kellogg 373
The National Security League. By Edgar Dawson 373

BOOKS:
The Original Version of "Love's Labour's Lost" 374
The Life and Times of Stephen Girard 375
John Spargo's Socialism 376
England in the Seven Years' War..... 376
Joan and Peter 377

NOTES:
The Psychology of Conviction 378
Santo Domingo: A Country with a Future.... 378
The Diary of a Girl in France in 1821 378
The Wonderful Story of Joan of Arc 379
In a Day of Social Rebuilding 379
Phantasms of the Living 379

ART:
The Exhibition with a Promise. By N. N.... 380

DRAMA:
The Theatre To-day and To-morrow. By J. R. T. 381

BOOKS OF THE WEEK..... 382

The Writing and Reading of Verse
By CLARENCE EDWARD ANDREWS
Explains the general theory of verse and the principles of rhythm, metre, and movement, and the technique of verse forms as a help to those who would use them. There is also an interesting discussion of vers libre 8vo, $2.00 *net*, at all booksellers.
THIS IS AN APPLETON BOOK
D. Appleton & Co., Publishers, N.Y.

FOOD AND THE WAR
Prepared under the direction of the Collegiate Section of the United States Food Administration with the coöperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Education, for use in classes organized in response to Mr. Hoover's suggestions. 379 pp. Cloth binding. 80 cents. Postpaid.
Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston

Just Published
Primeras Lecciones de Español
By CAROLINA MARCIAL DORADO
A beginners' book in Spanish especially adapted to the needs of the junior high school. Every lesson is short and contains only words in common use. Stories and anecdotes adapted from the Spanish folklore, simple rimes and riddles that every Spanish child knows, games and songs connected with the lessons add interest and variety while laying a foundation in simple, correct Spanish. Attractive illustrations depict child life in Spain and provide an excellent basis for conversation.
307 *pages, illustrated,* 96 *cents*
GINN AND COMPANY
BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO LONDON

The Government *of the* British Empire
By EDWARD JENKS, B.C.L., M.A.
An experienced writer and teacher in political matters, who presents a comprehensive view of the Empire's system of government in simple, untechnical language.
372 *pages. With map.* 12mo.
$2.00 net
LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers, BOSTON

Teachers' Agencies

THE FISK TEACHERS' AGENCIES
EVERETT O. FISK & Co., *Proprietors.*
Boston, 2A Park Street. Denver, 817 Masonic Bldg.
New York, 155 Fifth Ave. Portland, 514 Journal Bldg.
Pittsburgh, 549 Un. Arcade. Berkeley, 2161 Shattuck Ave.
Chicago, 814 Steger Bldg. Los Angeles, 533 Cit. Bk. Bld.
Birmingham, Ala., 809 Title Building.
Send to any address above for agency manual.

HARLAN P. FRENCH, Pres. W. W. ANDREWS, Sec.
ALBANY TEACHERS' AGENCY, Inc.
Supplies Schools and Colleges with Competent Teachers, Assists Teachers in obtaining positions. Send for Bulletin. 81 Chapel Street, Albany, N. Y.

Colleges

The Women's College of Delaware
Four-year courses leading to A.B. and B.S. degrees in Arts and Science, Education, Home Economics and Agriculture. Special two-year courses in Education and Home Economics. Two-year course in Agriculture for college graduates. *Tuition free to students from the State of Delaware.*
FOR CATALOG AND INFORMATION ADDRESS
WINIFRED J. ROBINSON, Ph.D., Dean,
Newark, Delaware.

A High School Course in Two Years
Learn in your own home. Here is a thorough, complete, and simplified high school course that you can finish in two years. *Meets all college entrance requirements.* Prepared by leading members of the faculties of universities and academies. Write for booklet. Send your name and address for our booklet and full particulars. No obligations whatever. Write today—now.
AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CORRESPONDENCE,
Dept. H-1007, Chicago, U. S. A.

FOREIGNER, COLLEGE MAN, WANTS conversation lessons from pleasant and educated person for finishing touch.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY'S NEW BOOKS

IMPORTANT FICTION

THE FOUR HORSEMEN OF THE APOCALYPSE

By VICENTE BLASCO IBANEZ, Author of "The Shadow of the Cathedral." *First edition exhausted, 2nd issued Sept. 20, 3d on press.* *Net, $1.90*

Authorized Translation by CHARLOTTE BREWSTER JORDAN.

"So far *the* distinguished novel of the war. Señor Ibanez sees it through eyes that are world wide in their sweep and with a mind that is very pitiful and human."—*Brooklyn Eagle.*

"A great novel, one of the three or four outstanding novels of the war, rich and varied in scene, human in its characterization, and, above all, refreshingly straightforward and conclusive on the subject of the Germans and their methods of warfare."—*The Globe,* New York.

A DREAMER UNDER ARMS

By F. G. HURRELL *Net, $1.50*

A delicate, sympathetic story of a beautiful and sensitive nature groping and growing through life at the front into a fine sense of the purpose of the war.

SALT, or THE EDUCATION OF GRIFFITH ADAMS

By CHARLES G. NORRIS

Third Edition. *Net, $1.50*

"This book is assuredly one that must be very seriously reckoned with among the important fiction of to-day."—*New York Tribune.*

FOURTEENTH EDITION.

UNDER FIRE

By HENRI BARBUSSE *Net, $1.50*

Translated by Fitzwater Wray.

"All I have heard discussing it are agreed on its literary beauty and its tremendously real significance. It is a splendid thing to have written a Romance from which history will borrow."—*Edmond Rostand.*

POEMS OF RARE BEAUTY

LANTERNS IN GETHSEMANE

By WILLARD WATTLES *Net, $1.50*

Verse of such rare and touching beauty as to give the reader a sense of actual nearness to a divinely human Christ.

BOYS' ADVENTURE STORIES

THE LOST NATION

By EVERETT McNEIL *Net, $1.50*

THE TRAIL OF THE CLOVEN FOOT

By A. HYATT VERRILL *Net, $1.50*

Books of the only type which can draw a boy's mind from the dominance of the war story—tales of hidden treasure and high adventure in strange lands.

IMPORTANT FRENCH MANUALS

SOLDIERS' SPOKEN FRENCH

By HELENE CROSS *Net, 60 cts.*

Possibly the most widely adopted of all the French manuals used by army instructors.

FRENCH IN A NUTSHELL

By JEAN LEEMAN *Net, $1.00*

Compact, handy for immediate use. Endorsed by the Alliance Française.

Send for a complete list of the volumes in

DUTTON'S MODERN LANGUAGE SERIES

JUST READY

THE ECONOMICS OF PROGRESS

By the RIGHT HON. J. M. ROBERTSON, M.P.

The author outlines from the economic standpoint the main lines along which "a rise in the quantity and quality of pleasurable life" may be hoped for. He examines in turn Education, Labor, Land, Capital, Commerce, and Population. *Net,* $5.00

THE NEAR EAST FROM WITHIN

By ****, an ANONYMOUS BUT QUALIFIED AUTHOR

These revelations of the sinister activities of the Kaiser in regard to the Balkans, Turkey, and Egypt explain much that has been hitherto confused. The absorbing narrative has been since soon after its first issue entirely unobtainable in this country. *Net,* $5.00

THE SILENT WATCHERS

By BENNET COPPLESTONE, Author of "The Lost Naval Papers"

A fascinating account, stimulating appreciation of the spirit and the deeds of the vast unsleeping British navy. The author's sources of information are the highest, and his narrative power most unusual. *Net,* $2.00

AMERICAN PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION

Their Economic and Financial Aspects. ELISHA M. FRIEDMAN, of the Council of National Defence, General Editor

Contributors to this symposium are Frank A. Vanderlip, Prof. Irving Fisher, Charles M. Schwab, and others of the best-known economic and financial experts of the United States. *In press*

BRITAIN AFTER THE PEACE

By BROUGHAM VILLIERS, Author of "The Socialist Movement in England"

No one believes that things in general can ever again be as before the war, but who can solve the coming problems of demobilization, industrial control, taxation, foreign relations, and a dozen more? Mr. Villiers' ideas are so sane and clearly put that his book is a welcome contribution to any discussion of the future. *Net,* $2.50

CREATIVE IMPULSE IN INDUSTRY

By HELEN MAROT

The big idea underlying this book is, "How can America's war-awakened industrial efficiency be maintained in peace times without Prussianizing the workers?" It is vital. *Net,* $1.50

A VILLAGE IN PICARDY

By RUTH GAINES, Author of "Treasure Flower," etc. Introduction by Dr. WILLIAM ALLEN NEILSON, President of Smith College.

A simple, direct, notably charming account of a rehabilitation work in France, of so great value that probably no later work of the kind will be undertaken without reference to this record of what was there done and learned by the Smith College Relief Unit in France. *Net,* $1.50

FAR AWAY AND LONG AGO

A History of My Early Life. By W. H. HUDSON

Fascinating personal anecdotal reminiscences of the great naturalist. The reader follows from scene to scene with all the zest of tracing a blazed trail in a new and picturesque country. The restful atmosphere of the book is a part of its great charm. *Net,* $2.50

MAN'S SUPREME INHERITANCE

By F. MATTHIAS ALEXANDER

With an Introductory Word by Professor John Dewey, who feels that the author's principles of conscious guidance and control of the physical organism are a valuable "contribution to the understanding of every phase of contemporary life." *Net,* $2.00

POSTAGE EXTRA. ON SALE AT ALL BOOKSELLERS

E. P. DUTTON & CO. 681 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nation

Vol. CVII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1918 No. 2779

The Week

IT is not yet clear how much importance is to be attached to the reports of pending political overturns in Germany and Austria-Hungary. The capacity of the Governments of both of those countries for producing, purely for effect abroad, the appearance of internal dissension, and of juggling with parties and their leaders for the purpose of granting the shadow rather than the substance of political reform, is too well known to require comment. There can be no doubt, however, that the political ferment in both countries is widespread, and that it has been increasing rapidly during the past two or three weeks. The resignation now reported of Count von Hertling, the Imperial German Chancellor, is not unexpected. He has never been a strong man politically, and his brief term of office has coincided, obviously to his disadvantage, with a rapid cementing of the power of the military group headed by von Ludendorff. His retirement now may pave the way for the formation of a coalition ministry with at least one Socialist member—a change which was reported to be impending a week or two ago. On the other hand, the collapse of the Bulgarian resistance to the Allies, together with the granting of an armistice, immensely complicates the political situation in Austria-Hungary. To all the other causes of weakness in the Dual Monarchy has now to be added the failure of one of its important allies to hold its own in the field. It is at least possible that the Entente Governments may not, after all, have a chance to insist upon the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary; the latter may break up of itself. There seems no reason as yet, however, to believe that such an outcome is near. The Allies are not yet fighting on either German or Austrian soil; and once territory of the Central Powers is invaded—if such a thing happens—the presence of a foreign army may reasonably be expected to stir up a resistance to conquest quite different from the spirit which has supported the war down to the present time.

THERE was one disappointing feature in President Wilson's great speech—he told us nothing about his Russian policy. So far as the country as a whole is concerned it is entirely in the dark as to what is going on. Only one thing is clear, and that is that the *Nation* was well within the truth a few weeks ago when we wrote that our war with Russia had begun. Thus we read of American troops occupying Shoushougn, Tulgolsk, and Seltzo in the advance towards Kotlas. The dispatches have all the familiar phraseology. They tell, of course, of "enemy atrocities"; of "undoubtedly large enemy casualties"; of sinking "enemy gunboats," etc., etc. Thus this "friendly intervention" takes on all the marks of ordinary hostilities. How can the plain Russian be expected to differentiate? May he not say to us that it is all very well to dissemble our love, but why do we kick him downstairs—to say nothing of our artillery and machine-guns? Those who object to any criticism of our policy aver that if the critics only knew the facts they would write and speak differently. This may well be true. But if it is so why should we not be told the facts? The President is opposed to secret diplomacy; why should we be kept in ignorance as to his reasons for proceeding into Russia? It does not help to give out documents of doubtful authenticity alleging that Trotzky and Lenine are in German pay; particularly as some of the European correspondents declare that, despite the atrocities committed by the Reds, which our Government has so eloquently portrayed, the Bolsheviki are stronger than ever.

PROGRESS in the formation of joint industrial councils, as recommended by the Whitley report of March, 1917, was reported by the British Minister of Labor, Mr. G. H. Roberts, speaking before a meeting of the National Union of Journalists on August 24. It will be remembered that the plan contemplates a coöperation between employers and employees in organized industries, taking the form of workshop committees (and of so-called works committees as well if the establishment is a complex one), of joint district councils, and finally of joint national councils covering an entire industry. The aim is not merely to improve the material condition of the worker, but above all to change his status by making him an integral part of the productive unit. The guild socialists hope that the system may prove capable of development along the lines of their theory; in case of state control it offers a method of counteracting the dangers of bureaucracy; at the same time it does not clash with trade unionism proper, as is proved by the vote of the Derby Trade Union Congress on September 3, recommending, without discussion, "frank acceptance of the principles embodied in the Whitley report, and the setting up in each industry of joint industrial councils, thereby averting future serious industrial disputes and consequent trade dislocation." Mr. Roberts's report shows nine councils in existence, nineteen in process of formation, and twenty in other trades in preliminary stages. An earlier, but undated, inquiry of the Ministry of Labor had reported works committees organized in twenty-three firms, one scheme for a district council, and one for a national council. Following Mr. Roberts, the president of the National Union of Journalists stated that steps were being taken to call together a conference of representative bodies in "the newspaper trade," with the object of organizing a council—an interesting suggestion in view of the Labor party's attempt to unite the intellectual and professional classes with the manual workers.

THE reasons for the fall of the Terauchi Ministry in Japan are by no means clear as yet. The accession of the former Governor-General of Korea to the premiership was generally expected to mean a sword-rattling imperialistic policy. On the contrary, Count Terauchi withdrew from the extreme position of the Okuma Cabinet in relation to China and pursued a policy of conciliation towards that distracted country, meanwhile fortifying the position of Japan by means of the mysterious Lansing-Ishii agreement with the United States. This moderate policy occasioned a certain amount of dissatisfaction, but on the whole

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aroused less criticism than the handling of the Siberian situation. While a group of fire-eaters, in Japan as here, has from the first urged intervention and the strong hand, the Japanese statesmen, like President Wilson, have hesitated to take a step so full of dangerous possibilities. Meanwhile food conditions in Japan became bad, public feeling was strongly aroused against the rice merchants and against the Government that failed to prevent food profiteering, and serious riots occurred in many of the principal cities during July and August. By attempting to suppress the news of these disturbances, the Ministry aroused yet further the hostility of the press, already sharply critical, and many of the newspapers attribute its fall directly to its action in this particular. The rice riots, in the opinion of a well-informed correspondent, "answer a difficult question as to how much the workers here would really stand. The action they have taken is one of the most hopeful things that has happened in Japan for many years. After a way of its own this is one of the most democratic countries in the world, but sometimes its own leaders forget the fact." Through all the confusion and uncertainty, one thing is clear. The same democratic forces that are threatening ministries and overturning thrones in the West are at work in the Island Empire of the East. Amid the ferment of Japanese life, the old clan Government is finding it increasingly difficult to maintain itself. There is a strong movement for responsible party Government and a demand for the improvement of the economic condition of the mass of the people. To that demand Count Terauchi was largely deaf; Premier Hara can scarcely be so.

AMBASSADORS Náon and Da Gama were last week presented with medals in recognition of their services in adjusting the difficulties between the United States and Mexico following the Vera Cruz incident. This graceful act of our Government ought not to be allowed to pass without a word of grateful acknowledgment on the part of the American press to the distinguished men so fittingly honored and to the peoples whom they represent. Inter-American affairs occupy only an insignificant place in the consciousness of our people, even in normal times, and at present we tend to forget the existence of our American neighbors. Yet few events in our recent history have been more important in a large view of affairs than the A. B. C. intervention, without which we should almost certainly have become involved in war with Mexico. What would have been the effect of such an embroilment on the issue of the present world struggle? It is sobering to think how narrowly we avoided such a disaster, and we cannot be too grateful to the men who saved us from it. It might be well if the incident served to remind us that we have much to learn from the countries to the south in regard to the amenities of international intercourse and the adjustment of international difficulties. In our ignorant strength we forget the fineness of the civilizations that flourish between the Rio Grande and Cape Horn. The Pan-Americanism of coöperation, not domination, most of us have yet to learn; we cannot learn it too quickly. And if our relations with Mexico have not yet reached a wholly satisfactory point, we may at least be grateful that after six years of revolution that country is of itself gradually working its way back towards peace and settled conditions, instead of seeing order restored at the point of American bayonets—order that would rest for decades on a basis of mutual hatred.

THE suffrage collapse in the Senate must fill right-thinking people with disgust. Plainly the various postponements have been due to insincerity from the start. Although the President had most admirably called on the Senate to perform this act of justice to the women of America, who have so bravely shouldered the burdens of war, Congress refuses. Every time a vote has approached some member of the Senate has changed his mind or dodged the issue. Just why Senator Benet should have played traitor this time is not clear. That Mr. Wilson was obliged to appeal personally to the Senate is in itself humiliating. At the very moment when we are pouring forth blood and treasure to safeguard democracy, the Senate is not willing to extend the vote to our women and thereby safeguard it for millions at home. A close analysis would, we think, show that it is the color line which has again defeated this reform. Thus does one great wrong and injustice perpetuate another. Mr. Wilson has tacitly assented to race discrimination, indeed helped to fasten it upon the Government in Washington itself. Now it arises to block a reform to which he is strongly committed. It is almost the first time that Congress has defied his will since the war began; we dislike to think that it will mean further disturbances, bitter feeling, and great unhappiness to thousands on thousands of loyal workers the country over. It will read particularly badly in Russia and among our more democratic allies. The United States as a nation refuses at this time to take its stand by the side of the other great English-speaking countries in which the enfranchisement of women has been hastened by the war. The action of the Senate illustrates once more the difficulty of amending our Constitution in the face of a determined majority.

THE news of the disappointment at Washington follows hard on the heels of a distinct victory for women in another field, however. According to a recent statement printed in the *Chief*, the Civil Service Commission of the City of New York, inspired apparently by the scarcity of men in all the city departments, has swept aside most of the sex distinctions hitherto prevailing in the municipal civil service. Except for certain positions specifically announced to be for men only, all examinations will be open to women. This ruling is reported to include positions in the Fire, Police, and Street Cleaning Departments. It is against nature and experience, however, that such a measure should go through with no strings attached. If a test is announced as open to both sexes, one list will be certified to the department with the names arranged according to percentages; but in cases where the official announcement of a test does not state specifically that both sexes are eligible, women who compete will be placed on a separate list. The men's list will be certified first, and only when it is exhausted will the women's list be sent to the appointing officer. Already an examination has been announced in which both men and women may compete for the position of patrolman on the Aqueduct. When the Board of Water Supply heard that women were to be allowed to take the examination, they are reported to have inquired of the Commission if they would "have to appoint them." They were promptly reassured. A representative of the *Chief* interviewed various department officials and found a general attitude of skepticism towards the new ruling. This feeling, which is traditional in most of the city departments, may be counted upon to temper considerably the impetuous

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feminism of the Civil Service Commission. On the other hand, even a "paper" emancipation is worth something, and the "male lists" may be exhausted sooner than department heads anticipate. Women should see in this ruling an encouragement to train themselves for positions of authority and responsibility in the city's service.

A RESOLUTION introduced into the House by Representative Frear, of Wisconsin, calls for an investigation of the National Security League and its efforts to influence the election of members of Congress. "The days are too critical," declares Mr. Frear, "for a war profiteering league to denounce as disloyal practically ninety per cent. of the membership of this House and forty-seven of the forty-eight States." The League's reply characteristically calls attention to Representative Frear's vote against the declaration of war and the Kahn amendment, and in favor of the McLemore amendment, suggesting by innuendo that he is a pacifist, if nothing worse. The League, in our judgment, despite the patriotic purpose of its founders, is in a fair way to become an unqualified public nuisance. We have long been of the opinion that many of its methods were operating directly to prevent the maintenance of the unity so essential to national security, and we agree with Professor Dawson, who points out in our correspondence columns that unless those methods are radically changed its work is likely to do more harm than good. The disingenuous attack on Mr. Creel, briefly outlined in our issue of September 21, is an example of the type of cowardly assault that the League has not hesitated to launch against the men, no matter how respectable or responsible, with whom it happens to disagree. It is time for the thoughtful people of the country to call sharply to account any man or any organization that hurls about loose charges of disloyalty and pro-Germanism. Do the patriotic and distinguished men who are lending their names to the Security League desire longer to promote the campaign of abuse, disunity, and terrorism that it is carrying on?

APPARENTLY the United States Steel Corporation, the most nearly impregnable stronghold of anti-unionism, has had at last to give way to the principle of the eight-hour day. The steps leading up to this decision may be summarized thus: In the first place, the National War Labor Board recognized collective bargaining in its award to the Bethlehem Steel Corporation; second, by its decision in the case of Molder vs. Wheeling Mold and Foundry Company, it acknowledged the principle of the eight-hour day, just as President Wilson had done in the case of the railways; third, the directors of the Midvale Steel and Ordnance Company have called their employees into conference, recognizing "the right of the wage earners to bargain collectively with their employers"; and last, but probably by no means least, the American Federation of Labor at its June convention this year in St. Louis passed a resolution having for its object the union of all interested organizations in "one mighty drive to organize the steel plants of America," and appropriated to this end a sum of about $60,000. The United States Steel Corporation, in announcing the change from the ten-hour day basis to the eight-hour day, stated emphatically that its open-shop policy would continue. The apparent wage-increase due to the new day will perhaps postpone a further move for organization, unless the employers fail to maintain the agreement or to see that the twelve-hour workers get the increase which the basic eight-hour day would entail. Until the adoption of three eight-hour shifts, rather than two twelve-hour shifts, in the continuous operations, over 50,000 employees will go on working seventy-two hours a week, to their own detriment and that of society and of the industry itself. In view of the fact that the net earnings for this year of the United States Steel Corporation were $457,685,000, it would seem that financial considerations, at least, might permit this concession.

WAR is certainly a respecter of nothing sacred. Here is the ruthless hand of militarism laid squarely upon our college fraternities. Faculties had trembled before them and college presidents had bowed down, as in the case of football and baseball teams and their almighty coaches. The "frats" had multiplied and erected upon campus and "yard" their abodes, in some places the most luxurious dwellings in sight. But here comes a doughty colonel or two, and lo! at a simple order the fraternities shrivel up, and the keys remain in all the fraternity doors to rust until peace shall come. Truly the very foundations of our society are rocking. At Amherst, for instance, where more than ninety per cent. of the students have lived in fraternity houses, they are all to be turned out, according to a press dispatch; the army has discovered that they are not democratic, these fraternity houses, and will have none of them. Elsewhere, the news reads, the fraternities are to be for the present merely requested to omit their special activities until war is over. At Princeton, we suppose, this will be laid to the old and praiseworthy grudge of the Commander-in-Chief against the "side-shows" which had come to be "larger than the circus," to use his own words. Possibly he knows nothing of it; but if he reads of it we may be sure that it will be with a happy chuckle and the hope that this is one phase of our college life that peace will not restore.

THE selection of M. Monteux, conductor of French opera at the Metropolitan Opera House, as conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra for the month of October only, brings out anew the plight of that splendid body. As many as twenty-five members are said to have been dropped, a concert master was picked only the other day, and now the orchestra must enter upon its first season without Major Higginson at the helm and with but a temporary conductor; all this, too, with supersensitive patriots watching every move to see if the Americanization process is complete. Naturally, the orchestra is bound to suffer, however capable the new material. No temporary conductor, not even one with as excellent a reputation as M. Monteux, can, moreover, do much for the regeneration of the orchestra's *morale* in a month. Perhaps by the first of November the permanent leader will be found or M. Monteux will be appointed for the season. But for the first time in years this great organization will find itself in danger of being eclipsed by competitors. There is real tragedy in this situation, for few groups of orchestral artists have been so harmonious or have played together under such favorable circumstances for so many years with so few changes. No other American orchestra has quite come up to their standard because of their continuity of service, which in turn has been due to the security afforded by Major Higginson's private means and to the pension fund long established.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Clearing Skies and a Trumpet Call

OF all the ten memorable weeks since the turning of the tide in France at Château-Thierry, none stands out as more amazing than the last. The military collapse of Bulgaria and her complete surrender, the steady Allied attack from the sea to the Meuse, including the successful Franco-American drive in the Champagne, the aftermath of General Allenby's great victory in Palestine, and, finally, President Wilson's remarkable address at the opening of the Liberty Loan campaign in New York, all serve to stamp these seven days as fraught with profound significance and unbounded encouragement for the Allied cause. On the military side the reversal of conditions since the 16th of July is so extraordinary as to seem almost incredible. Yet we are actually witnessing the piercing of the Hindenburg line at six points, the easy crossing of the apparently impregnable Canal du Nord, an advance by the Belgian army with most encouraging results after two years of inactivity, and an attack in the Champagne which is so critical for the Germans that if it is not promptly checked, the experts believe, Hindenburg and Ludendorff must consider a retreat to the German and Belgian frontiers. For the first time we read in the dispatches that the leading French experts believe that decisive events may take place "within the next few days."

It is in Bulgaria that we have the clearest proof of the growing demoralization of the Central Powers. Without detracting from the laurels justly earned by the allied French, British, and Serbians under General Franchet d'Esperey, it is perfectly obvious that so rapid an advance as eighty miles within a few days and the taking of such vital towns as Mochana, Ishtib, Veles, Kostendie, and the Bulgarian city of Strumitza must have some other explanation than Allied strategy and bravery. Had there been anything like the previous Bulgarian tenacity and stubbornness in battle, nothing resembling this rush over such extremely difficult terrain could have taken place. When the frontier was reached there appeared a high Bulgarian officer to announce that the Bulgarian Minister of Finance, M. Liaptcheff, and General Loukoff were on their way to French headquarters to arrange the conditions of an armistice and, eventually, terms of peace. A bolt from the blue could not have been more startling, for there had been little in the Allied or American press to lead any one to suspect that Bulgaria had had enough of war and was ready to detach herself from her dominating allies. True, there was a report that Dr. Solf, who seems slated for a high rôle in Germany, had been to Sofia on a special and secret mission, and the mysterious illness and travels of King Ferdinand had begun to arouse comment. Beyond this, however, there was nothing to suggest that there was serious trouble in Bulgaria or that her stone-wall defence of three years would go down like a paper house the instant it was assailed.

We may wait long for an explanation, or we may get it within the next few days. Was there an internal revolution? Did the Prime Minister and others assume authority and compel the King to follow them? Is the collapse due to a final refusal of the people to fight and suffer longer in a war —their third war in six years—as to the making of which they were never consulted? Will the German and Austrian reinforcements now being rushed to Bulgaria be able to stem the Allied tide, and can they actually take over the reins of government? The next week may develop the answers to these questions, in which no nation has a greater stake than Turkey; for if her rail communication with Germany is cut, she must collapse. Reeling as Turkey is under Allenby's successive blows, with two of her best armies wiped out and 50,000 men captured, the collapse of Bulgaria must mean the end of the rule of the little group of tyrants headed by Enver and Talaat who have been playing their own selfish game at the expense of their people these last few years. That there is consternation in Berlin is obvious. This is a terrible blow to fall upon Germany just when the situation on the western front—now one great salient which Foch is trying to smash in precisely the same way that the St. Mihiel salient was crushed in by our troops—is so serious that there are signs of panic. When Hindenburg and the Kaiser are exhorting their dupes to stand fast and be "hard," when Chancellor von Hertling and the Prussian Minister of War resign within the same week, it needs no soothsayer to divine that all is far from well at Potsdam.

We have always maintained that if the German *morale* began to crack it would crack quickly, and widely. Germans are not accustomed to evil days—and have not been since the first Napoleonic era. The boundless measure of their pride and conceit, their absolute certainty of the victory which seemed in their grasp ten weeks ago, affords the measure of the shock it will be to them if all their hopes and expectations fail, if adversity sets in so as to threaten their utter defeat. Theirs is not the temper of the French to endure disaster in patience and steadfastness; defeat is likely to let loose the deep and ugly dislike and hatred for the governing classes which the patriotic fervor of war has submerged for four years.

As for Mr. Wilson's speech, it is undoubtedly one of his very great utterances. Not that we can agree with him that the war is now or ever was a people's war, in the sense in which he uses the phrase, but he has again sounded a noble note of warning to the nations of the world as to what must come out of this titanic struggle if the world is in remotest degree to profit thereby. Although he especially disclaims it, this speech remains as distinctly a warning to Allied imperialists as to the enemy. He serves notice upon all who have ears to hear that the peace for which he still stands is the peace of absolute justice without "compromise or abatement of the principles we have avowed as the principles for which we are fighting." Glorious words! May imperialists everywhere—the Sonninos, Curzons, Milners, Balfours, and Northcliffes—take warning, as well as every single Junker in Prussia and Austria! The proposal for a league of nations *now* he dispatches with five words: "It cannot be formed now," and he adds: "If formed now it would be merely a new alliance confined to the nations associated against a common enemy." And he goes on with similar wisdom to declare that the impartial justice to be meted out "must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just," to affirm that no special interest shall control in any negotiation, that there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants within the general family of the league of nations and no economic boycott whatever unless voted by the whole league of nations—and finally that there must be "open covenants of peace and trade." These are the words of the true statesman. Here speaks the most powerful of rulers dictating the terms of peace anew.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

These words will rock every chancellery in Europe; for the dominating head of the dominating power in this war has reaffirmed his fourteen peace terms at the very moment that diplomats of the old type are beginning to parcel out the spoils. As a peace offensive it is masterly, for it will give the Germans assurance that their fate is to be settled not by revenge but by justice. As for our own brave troops, battling and dying in the belief that a new freedom is to arise out of the welter of their blood and their souls, if they have but half the intelligence the world knows to be theirs they must realize that a mightier blow has been struck for them by their commander-in-chief than all their cannon could effect.

The European Coal Crisis

THE coal shortage which confronts the United States, and which threatens, unless some very radical action is taken at once, to bring on a fuel famine next winter for more than one community and even for large sections of the country, is only the American phase of a problem which is staring in the face every country in Europe and bids fair to interfere seriously with the conduct of military operations. The whole of Western and Southern Europe is suffering from an unparalleled shortage of coal. What that means, in the last analysis, is that the British coal output has fallen behind the demand; for it is upon the importation of British coal that France, Spain, Italy, and Switzerland, not to mention more distant countries, are compelled to draw in order to supplement their own deficient natural supplies.

How serious the British coal situation is has not, we fear, been at all sufficiently realized in this country. As far back as August 20 the Coal Controller, Sir Guy Calthrop, in an address at the conference of the British Miners' Federation, stated that he was faced with a shortage of 36,000,000 tons a year. By a strict rationing of household coal, gas, and electricity, it was hoped to save 9,000,000 tons over last year's consumption. The only way to save the remaining 27,000,000 tons was, he declared, by rationing the less essential industries and at the same time increasing the output of the mines. In the meantime, however, reserve stocks were being reduced below the ordinary margin of safety, shipments to the Allies were falling behind, and even essential war industries were threatened with a reduction of their necessary allotment. Already employers are representing that millions of workers are threatened with unemployment, and train facilities are to be further reduced.

The response of the Miners' Federation to the Coal Controller's appeal was the adoption of a resolution calling upon the miners to increase their output. The reasons for the shortage, however, like the ominous results which it has already produced or clearly threatens, are practical matters with which resolutions alone cannot cope. Over 400,000 British miners have enlisted in various branches of the service. Seventy-five thousand had to be recruited last March to help stem the German advance. France, which in peace times imports large quantities of coal from Great Britain, finds half its coal fields in German hands, and is rationing its population at the rate of less than one and one-half tons per household a year. Italy is practically destitute of coal save for that which Great Britain can send her, and Switzerland, which also has no coal, must import it from Germany if it cannot be obtained from the Allies. The American troops in France and Italy have been taken to the front largely by British coal. All of these requirements have had to be met at the same time that the demands of the British fleet and army, of munition factories and shipyards, and of a host of indispensable war industries were showing an unparalleled increase. With more coal used, and fewer men to mine it, Great Britain is now face to face with a shortage which averages about five tons a year for each family in the kingdom.

How far the Government is responsible for the coal situation is still a subject of acrimonious debate. The drafting of miners into the army has been defended on the ground that, unless the army had been maintained at its full strength, the westward progress of the Germans could not have been stayed; but an army is useless if the things which enable it to fight are not forthcoming, and supplies can be neither made nor transported without coal. The Government policy of recruiting miners without filling their places is, after all, only robbing one hand to supply the other. The miners, on their part, have been far from blameless. They have higgled over wages and union rules and bonuses and pit committees in the face of a national peril, and have failed to convince the public that their loyal resolutions were being turned into the one thing needful—a maximum output of coal.

It is the gravity of the coal situation which has led the Lloyd George Government to take the drastic step which it has just taken to end the railway strike in Wales. The strike, occasioned by the dissatisfaction of the railway engineers with the settlement of a recent dispute, was confined to South Wales, but it threatened a widespread disorganization of industry through an interruption of the coal supply. The Government promptly sent a number of regiments to Cardiff, and the engineers returned to work. Had such a step been taken in Germany, the press of the world would have been filled with denunciations of Prussianism, and with predictions of the early collapse of an arbitrary Government which was coercing labor by military force. That the Lloyd George Government should have taken such action, and that public opinion should have condemned the strikers and supported the Government, is proof, not that Great Britain is becoming Prussianized, but that the coal problem is clearly seen to spell calamity unless some means can be found of solving it.

It is not clear that means of solving it can be found. There is no exportable surplus of coal in the United States, nor are there ships to carry it if there were. In spite of the optimistic figures of Mr. Hurley and Mr. Schwab, the tonnage with which to transport the 6,000,000 tons of coal which it was expected Great Britain would be able to furnish for the needs of the American army in France, but which General Pershing has now been compelled to call for from the United States, is not in sight. Unless all signs fail, there will be greater suffering in this country next winter from the lack of coal than the nation has ever experienced, but there will be still greater suffering in England and France and Italy. No possible economies, least of all the pitiful and sporadic ones which seem to content Mr. Garfield, will add to our coal supply; they will only make the situation a bit less intolerable. The only way to increase the supply is to mine more coal, and that means more labor and increased output per man. With the widespread unrest that now exists in the labor world, Government control of essential industries is facing its severest test.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Humble Inquiry

WE raise again the question of civil liberty, this time not by way of criticism or remonstrance, but in the spirit of pure inquiry. We should like to know upon what principle the regulation of the press is organized and carried on. Our intellectual curiosity is powerfully stimulated by the case of the *Truth Seeker*, a weekly, of special appeal and presumably rather small circulation, published in New York and styling itself a "free thought and agnostic newspaper." Its issues of August 31 and September 7 have been declared unmailable. The editor issues a statement in which he says that this was done because of a reference to the Y. M. C. A. as a commercial organization, and that the Post Office based its action on the ruling of a Federal judge in Wisconsin, in a similar case, that the term "military and naval forces" in the Espionage Act included the volunteer religious and humanitarian organizations engaged in war relief work.

If this be law, dubious as it seems, it presumably must be accepted as such and obeyed accordingly. We merely ask upon what principle of interpretation the Y. M. C. A., for example, can possibly be reckoned among the military and naval forces of the United States. What shadow of color appears in the Espionage Act to show that any such notion was in the mind of the Congress that passed the bill or of the President who signed it? A Latin proverb says it is the function of a good judge to extend his jurisdiction, but surely in sound law as well as sound sense there must be somewhere a limit to this laudable enterprise. Not long age we read a notice of a book written by a prominent Red Cross official, in which the reviewer said that any one who could write such a good book ought to come back and practice literature instead of remaining abroad with the Red Cross. Under the ruling cited, this bit of wholly innocent enthusiasm might have cost the reviewer $10,000 and twenty years in prison for wilfully causing or attempting to cause refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States. Surely, if the energetic Wisconsin judge can thus interpret the plain sense of the Espionage Act off the face of the earth, the function of criticism is suspended and democracy in the United States is in a shockingly bad way. We are the more interested by reason of the indictment of Assemblyman Shiplacoff for saying publicly that the people of Russia would have more reason to feel bitterly about the invasion of Russia by American troops than our American colonists had for the same feeling about the Hessians who were brought over to deny them their liberties. Where is this all to end?

The fact is that in passing the act the Congress did not, we believe, intend to put any man or body of men, even the army or navy, beyond the reach of criticism. It is not intended to be a law of *lèse majesté*. The news reports state that in the Debs case Judge Westenhaver charged the jury emphatically that the act was not aimed against opinions at variance with those of the majority of the people or those of the Government; that it is not a crime to disapprove of the war, or to criticise the Administration or the conduct of the war, provided there be no criminal intent. This falls in precisely with what President Wilson and at least two members of his Cabinet have publicly said. Here then is precedent for precedent; and between the two there is left in the hands of minor executive officials an absolutely impracticable and impossible latitude for discretion. Foreign critics continually reproach Americans with an utterly unscrupulous use of law as a convenience for satisfying some personal or political desideratum. Our practice known as "railroading," our holding of suspects on a "technical charge," and our frequent presumption of guilt until the suspect proves himself innocent, as in the slacker raid—all these seem utterly hateful to them. Mr. Shaw especially never wearies of taunting us as a mere brood of anarchists, devoid of any regard for principle.

What could be possibly more puzzling to Mr. Shaw, or indeed to any clear-minded critic, native or foreign, than an attempt to reconcile the case of the *Truth-Seeker* with the plain language of the Espionage Act, the no less plain language of the President and his two Cabinet officers, and the explicit charge of Judge Westenhaver in the Debs case? One thing only, perhaps; namely, an attempt to reconcile the ruling of the Wisconsin judge with anything in related law or equity. The lack of intellectual seriousness involved in either attempt produces a most painful impression on the thoughtful observer.

A Gasless-Sunday Reverie

THE restoration of the New York City Hall reminds us to be thankful that this exquisite building was after all so little damaged by fire. It is a priceless possession. When the foreign delegations headed by Marshal Joffre and Mr. Balfour were received there last year, one could see how perfect a setting it afforded for an historical picture. On the other hand, our collective life is the poorer and weaker for the destruction of St. John's Chapel on Varick Street. No one can say that the sentiment of beauty is overdone in England, yet even in London an historic and beautiful edifice commands a decent respect. The Strand runs around St. Clement Danes; the street gives way to the building. But here, because St. John's encroaches a few feet on the widened thoroughfare, it is torn down. Part of the handwrought iron fence around the Bowling Green has disappeared, and no one seems to know what has become of it. In Colonial days, its posts were surrounded by iron crowns which were knocked off by the populace and the Continental soldiers at the time King George's statue was razed, and the rough tops of the posts were never smoothed—one could see them still just as they were left.

The worst of such mistakes as these is that they are irreparable. Americans will not always be quite like ourselves. Future generations, we humbly hope, will enjoy advantages that have been denied us of the present. We are making immense sacrifices, at least, to insure them such; and with those advantages the claims of beauty and poetry will make themselves felt and will be heeded as an essential part of life. Our descendants will find a way of reconciling and harmonizing these claims with those of industry and commerce, because they will be interested in doing so. They will see that efficiency demands it, that hideousness really counts against efficiency; that life goes on more profitably, that people become capable of greater and more varied achievements, when surrounded by beautiful and romantic objects rather than by ugly and stupid ones. Then St. John's will be missed. Then no one would be vexed or impatient with its trifling encroachment on Varick Street, or with the very slight curve that might have been given the thor-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oughfare in order to clear it. But St. John's cannot be brought back. If the Bowling Green railing has been tossed aside or sold for junk, it cannot be brought back; and by so much will our descendants feel that we have defrauded them.

We may be thankful, then, for the City Hall and for the few other odds and ends of beauty that for the most part live a clandestine sort of life in out-of-the-way nooks and corners of New York, and are to be seen only on Sundays when the streets are quiet; best of all on the recent gasless Sundays. Hideousness reigns over us six days a week in unchallenged supremacy; the life of the city, struggling to meet the hard conditions of a dismal and illiberal efficiency, goes on "growling, roaring, smoking, stinking," as Ruskin said of London; and between vehicles and the surge of intent pedestrian crowds, one may spare vision only for the uncertain way of safety. But on Sunday afternoons one may pause at ease before the little Italian church on Mott Street, consider St. Mark's and its surroundings at the head of the Bowery, or wander with attention undisturbed through the maze of pleasant old streets lying west of Washington Square, looking at the beautiful doorways and the quaint, attractive houses that survive there in surprising number; well kept, too, though by some odd superstition it passes for a broken-down neighborhood.

There is profit to the spirit in this. Quite apart from a definite antiquarian interest, one comes into Emerson's restful "feeling of longevity," and with it possibly a slight instinctive change in one's sense of values. One need know next to nothing of English history to get a considerable readjustment of one's workaday attitude towards this present world out of a forenoon's loafing through the Temple, if one be not wholly proof against such influences; it is done by mere contact with an immensely long past. So, if, some pleasant Sunday, one loses oneself anywhere between Charlton Street and Jackson Square, west of Sixth Avenue, one need not know the legends of Paine and Burr and Richmond Hill, of Minetta Water and the Potter's Field, to gain some slight, profitable, and highly delightful, if more or less indefinite, appreciation of what a greater philosopher than Emerson called the *πολυχρονιώτατα καὶ σοφώτατα τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων.*

"For us to love our country," said Burke, "our country ought to be lovely." This is precisely the right criticism of the type of civilization which it is the Anglo-Saxon instinct to construct; it touches the root of its impermanence. Dickens incorporated this criticism as a central theme into most of his novels and stories with such effect that one would perhaps best describe our civilization as the civilization of Gradgrind, Chadband, Quinion, and Pecksniff; how easy to imagine these four gigantic spirits brooding over all the international councils in the world to-day and giving form, temper, and substance to their deliberations! Their civilization is restlessly busy, very rich, given to a high factitious morality and an inveterate self-righteousness. It is overspread with the blight of hardness, and the penalty that Nature puts upon hardness is hideousness. Hence, in spite of its wealth and strength, it cannot permanently last. The instinct of beauty will in the long run emerge and take revenge—perhaps by violence, as in the Restoration period when the reaction from Puritan domination brought in the Buckinghams and Sedleys, the Wycherleys and Rochesters. Somehow it will emerge; and those who now work for its free emergence and its orderly, natural play may perhaps prove to be society's best servants.

The Undertakers' Friend

"VON HINDENBURG Spurs Army On," reports a headline. So the old rascal lives, after all. In the last six months, to our certain knowledge, he has actually died four times, once after a violent quarrel with the Kaiser—or was it the Crown Prince?—and has been in four sanitariums and three insane asylums. Apoplexy and delirium due to defeat and uncontrolled anger have also bothered him somewhat, according to these always veracious Amsterdam and Berne dispatches. As far back as April 29 he was wounded by an airplane, his death from this cause being reported by German prisoners on May 14. On the 22d he was still dead, but two days later this report was declared to be distinctly exaggerated. So rapid was his recovery from this wound and so trying his luck that he had typhoid fever bestowed upon him by the New York newspapers on May 27, but it was not until June 19 that the Geneva *Tribune* reported his mental capacity seriously affected.

If any one should think that during the subsequent months the Field-Marshal has been any less strenuous or less favored with excitement, he is much mistaken. In the intervals of a successful offensive which carried him within long-distance range of Paris and a hasty retreat to the line which bears his name, this noble hero has fought one duel and—within the last ten days—has successfully dodged a bullet fired at him by an anonymous Bavarian prince. The offender is shrewdly suspected by Amsterdam to be Crown Prince Rupprecht, apparently because Rupprecht is going to take a second wife—without, by the way, having asked the approval and consent of Mrs. Gertrude Atherton, whose consequent irritation seems quite marked. Besides this, we have had authentic reports that Hindenburg has been deposed by the Kaiser. Next comes a statement from the Kaiser (at Essen) that he is going direct from Krupp's to "our dear Field-Marshal," and then the positive affirmation that since von Hindenburg no longer exists he is being impersonated by Ludendorff, who, it appears, has been secretly trying to get rid of him right along.

As to his popularity, the magnetic needle which records the swing of popular favor oscillates frantically. On August 4 Amsterdam, through a former Canadian Postmaster-General, informed us that Hindenburg was "more popular than the Kaiser, who is envious of him." But Stockholm reported him on September 20 as no longer a popular hero, with "thousands of strong fists now raised against him by people who condemn him"; and now, hard on this, comes the story that by a single proclamation he buoys up all the faltering German army to swear the enemy shall not pass. If we could believe in the proverbial nine lives of the cat, we might be content to swallow all of this, remembering that you never can tell what the Prussian superman will do. But, frankly, the net result of it all is to produce in us the belief that there is no such thing as a Hindenburg, after all. He is a myth, and not a menace; a man of straw, and not of iron; as much of a superstition as the Siegfried and Wotan of the Hindenburg line, or the ever-coming victory of the U-boats.

If others do not feel as we do about this, at least we are happy to believe that the tales about him will not cease. He will still be the undertakers' friend.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Non-Partisan League in Politics

By FRANK G. MOORHEAD

AT the primary election on Tuesday, September 3, the Non-Partisan League nominated all of its candidates for State office on the Democratic ticket in Idaho and captured a majority of the legislative and county nominations. Its candidate for Governor polled practically as many votes as both his opponents. The League carried Ada County (in which the capital city, Boise, is located), notwithstanding the fact that measures approaching close to lawlessness had been employed to keep its organizers from operating there, and its president, A. C. Townley, from speaking there. On that day Idaho swung into line as the prospective companion of North Dakota as a League-dominated State, the first to take such action.

The Non-Partisan League has become the centre of attention in the Middle West and the Northwest as no other political movement has succeeded in doing in several decades. Successful again at the primary election in North Dakota, it went down in temporary defeat at the primaries in Minnesota (although it apparently secured control of the Legislature); it called upon the courts of Nebraska to grant it the right to operate; it was a force at work under the surface in the old-line party politics of Kansas; it named an independent State ticket for the November election in South Dakota; it was the cause of a great political fight in Iowa; and it had a more or less appreciable influence in the affairs of a half-dozen other States. Such is the record of an organization which was conceived in 1915 and which entered the political arena for the first time in 1916. With one Congressman in Washington, and with prospects good for the election of possibly a dozen more this fall, the Non-Partisan League sweeps into national prominence, having emerged from the stage of mere sectional existence and importance. The movement which began on $1.50 capital has grown until almost $5,000,000 has been collected or subscribed. The "rolling stock" which originally consisted of one second-hand Ford has increased to something like eight hundred cars, most of them new last summer, engaged every day in carrying League organizers into every rural district of a half dozen States.

At the 1916 election in North Dakota the Non-Partisan League elected its candidate for Governor, Lynn J. Frazier, a farmer, and every one of its candidates for State office, with the single exception of State Treasurer. It elected 87 out of 113 candidates for the lower house and 18 out of 25 candidates for the upper house of the Legislature. At a subsequent election it succeeded in electing its candidate for Congress, John M. Baer, by a good vote. At this year's primary it renominated Governor Frazier and all of the State officials who had remained loyal to it, and named a complete State ticket, from Supreme Justices down. It captured an overwhelming majority of both houses of the Legislature, so that, should it be victorious at the polls in November, as now seems certain, it will have undisputed control of every branch of the State Government—a control which it did not have two years ago, owing to the hold-over members of the upper house of the Legislature—and will be in a position to put through its programme of State-owned terminal elevators and flouring mills and State-operated hail insurance.

At this year's primary election in Minnesota, after one of the most vitriolic campaigns on record, the League was successful in nominating only one of its candidates for State office. Its candidate for Governor, Charles A. Lindbergh, for ten years Congressman from Minnesota, was snowed under by his opponent, Governor Burnquist. The League, coöperating with union labor, was successful, however, in nominating 80 out of 130 members of the lower house of the Legislature and 42 out of 67 members of the Senate, so that if it should be successful at the November election it would have a good working majority in both houses. Since the defeat of Mr. Lindbergh, the League, again coöperating with union labor, has placed an independent ticket in the field, headed by David H. Evans, of Tracy, an old-time Democrat, for Governor, and Thomas Davis for Attorney-General. At its regular State convention early in the summer union labor went on record in favor of entering politics, although it did not then nominate a ticket, preferring to affiliate with the League in support of Mr. Lindbergh. After the Lindbergh defeat, the League leaders got together and selected four men, any one of whom would be agreeable to them to head an independent ticket. On August 25, at a labor convention held at St. Paul, Mr. Evans (one of the four men suggested by the League) was nominated for Governor. The League polled over 150,000 votes for Lindbergh at the primaries, although claiming a membership of only 50,000 in the State. If it can poll as many votes in November, Mr. Evans will be a formidable candidate against the regular Republican and Democratic nominees.

In Nebraska the League has no State ticket, although it has nominees in a score or more counties, mainly for the Legislature and county offices. The League has found much difficulty in organizing in that State. One of its organizers was taken by an armed mob, in the dead of night, to an island in the Platte River, where one end of a rope was tied around his neck and the other thrown over the limb of a tree. He was given his life only on his promise to sell his League automobile, give the money to the Red Cross, and himself enlist in the United States army. This case is now being investigated by the Federal authorities. Matters reached such a pass, finally, that the League brought suit, at Lincoln, against the members of the State Council of Defence, which had ordered it to cease all efforts at organization and had prohibited it from holding a State convention for the purpose of nominating a State ticket. In the League's petition the charge is made that the State Council of Defence is "insisting that no new political parties shall be organized, but that the members of the League shall vote for either one or the other of the candidates of the two principal parties in Nebraska, while plaintiffs maintain that the voters are free to exercise the elective franchise by selecting their own nominees for office, and that the right to freely choose candidates is as valuable as the right to vote for them after they are chosen." The case went to trial in Lincoln, but was compromised after the League had introduced several witnesses, the State Council of Defence agreeing to withdraw open opposition if the League would withdraw all its paid organizers from the State,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secure a new State manager, and stop circulating Woodrow Wilson's "The New Freedom" as campaign material.

In Kansas the League has not openly participated in political affairs thus far, contenting itself with organizing for the campaign of 1920. It was favorable, however, to Governor Capper for nomination as United States Senator. There were four candidates in the field, among them being ex-Gov. Roscoe W. Stubbs, a prominent cattleman, who might reasonably have been expected to get the farmer support. Governor Capper was instructed by the Department of Justice to investigate the Non-Partisan League's activities and report if anything approaching disloyalty were found therein. He did investigate, and reported that the League was comporting itself according to law and the war needs of the nation. The League thereupon passed around the word that the Governor was friendly, and he succeeded in carrying every one of the 105 counties of the State in a four-cornered fight. In passing, it might be added that when the League desired to rent office rooms in the New England Building, at Topeka, it found written references from two well-known local residents to be required. It quickly returned with the required letters, signed by Governor Capper and his farm-paper editor, Tom McNeal. Capper success in Kansas is League success.

The League did not participate in the South Dakota primary election, with the result that the smallest vote ever known was polled. It has placed an independent ticket in the field, headed by Mark P. Bates, a farmer, for Governor, and hopes to be able to beat both old parties in the November election. Open antagonism has not been so apparent in this State as in most others of the Middle West. In fact, meetings which were prohibited during the campaign in Minnesota were sometimes held across the line in South Dakota, the speakers and the farmer-auditors merely driving a few miles, in their faithful "flivvers," until they reached more hospitable territory. Even in South Dakota, however, feeling is rising. On September 24, Messrs. Bates and Townley, according to a press dispatch, after an attempt to make a campaign speech at Britton, were seized by a mob and escorted to the county line.

In Iowa the League already has something like 15,000 members, one county alone (Humboldt) having 700 members, more than one-half of all the farmers resident there. It has not taken any direct part in the political affairs of the Hawkeye State as yet, simply preparing for the campaign of 1920. It has figured indirectly, however. James M. Pierce, a member of the State Council of Defence, has been forced to resign from that body because he championed the League through the columns of his farm paper, the *Iowa Homestead*. Mr. Pierce did not resign until eleven of the twenty-two members of the Council had passed a resolution calling upon the Governor to demand his resignation. The resolution included this passage: "It is our solemn judgment that the efforts of Mr. Pierce are disloyal and are aiding and encouraging disloyalty and sedition." Mr. Pierce was one of the most ardent supporters of Governor Harding two years ago, and is generally given credit for having been the principal factor in his election as Governor by the unprecedented majority of 126,754 votes. The whole affair has caused a breach between Iowa's Governor and certain members of the State Council of Defence, and Mr. Pierce, with one Des Moines newspaper alleging repeatedly that it was all a political "frameup" on the part of Democratic members of the State Council of Defence, with a view to disrupting the Republican support of Governor Harding and improving the chances of the Democrats at the November election.

In the Pacific Northwest the League has been eminently successful. It is strong in Montana, and will be a factor in the election there this fall, having succeeded in nominating 40 out of 95 members of the lower house and 15 out of 41 members of the upper house of the Legislature. It is gaining ground rapidly in Washington, where friendly coöperation on the part of the State Grange resulted in the indictment of the State Master of the Grange under the Federal Espionage Act.

It remained for Idaho, however, to be the first State, after North Dakota (where the movement started) captured in its entirety by the League. In Idaho it gained control of the Democratic party, which has been dominant in recent years; whereas in each of the other States it has worked, or attempted to work, through the Republican party, the dominant one in each case. On Tuesday, September 3, the Democrats of Idaho nominated H. F. Samuels for Governor after a campaign which will not soon be forgotten. Here is a newspaper report of a Townley meeting at Boise, the capital city:

> Boise, Idaho, August 27.—President A. C. Townley, of the Non-Partisan League, last night addressed 5,000 wildly enthusiastic people from the steps of the State Capitol building under the protection of Sheriff Emmett Pfost, of Ada County, after he had been refused permission to address an audience already assembled in the opera house to hear him after the Mayor of Boise had ordered him not to appear in the city park and the last resort of the so-called Ada County Defence League to prevent his appearance had failed.
>
> Three hundred special deputies, sworn in for the occasion, surrounded Townley and prevented a rush of the mob that had hidden itself behind the huge columns at the top of the Capitol steps from sweeping Townley off his feet and carrying out the programme to tar and feather him that had been outlined by Defence League leaders the previous day.
>
> Several mob leaders were seized by the Sheriff and his deputies and hustled out of the throng, while many persons were knocked down in their effort to release Karl Pain, corporation lawyer, and one of the captured ringleaders of the mob.
>
> Pain fought and struggled to get free, shouting to his followers: "Never mind me; don't pay any attention to me. Go back and break up that meeting. Townley shall not speak to-night."

Mr. Townley did speak, however, and a week later the voters declared overwhelmingly in favor of the man for whom he spoke.

This is the situation at the end of September. One State is now wholly within the hands of the League; a second will probably be so within six weeks. One Congressman has already been elected; another is so friendly that he has been renominated by the League; a possible dozen more stand a good chance of being elected. One friendly United States Senator is within easy sight of victory; one or two more are either friendly, allied, or secretly sympathetic. Three or four States will find, as a result of the coming elections, either that they are controlled by the League or that the League holds the balance of power. The League already claims some 300,000 members; 50,000 each in North Dakota and Minnesota, 30,000 each in Idaho and South Dakota, 20,000 in Nebraska, 15,000 in Iowa. Each of these members has paid or pledged a biennial membership fee, affording a working capital of $4,800,000. The political field in the Middle West and Northwest is ripe for just such a movement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Range of French Romanticism

By E. PRESTON DARGAN

FROM Balzac to M. Lanson, many writers have recorded the advance of the Romantic army upon Paris, nearly one hundred years ago. Personages of fact and of fiction, ardent undisciplined individuals such as Rastignac and the heroes of Stendhal, followed Napoleon, the "great *condottiere*," in the direction of lawless and materialistic ambition. Others, like the inner circle of Hugo and that of "Les Illusions perdues," linked their personalities to an idealistic cause. This was the youthful band, not gilded but gifted, for whom art was a constant mistress, poetry the divine word, and individual experience the key to the treasure-house of life. To follow this group in their tumultuous revolt and wild creative energy, we need to revamp some of the vexed values of Romanticism.

Expansionism and Relativity may be two of the main characteristics of the modern mind,* but the latter of these terms is hardly applicable to the Romantic movement, which is often considered as simply an exceptional eddy in the broad stream of French literature. One's mind may tend towards a skeptical relativity, but one's spirit dreams of the Absolute, and there was much more spirit than mind in these Romanticists. In their deification of human love and the fatality of passion, in their devotion to the long wonders of immortal beauty, they bring back to France a feeling which had been in abeyance since the Renaissance. But if they were not relativists, they certainly believed in every sort of Expansionism; one may view Romanticism, indeed, as centring in the indefinite expansion of the individual. This movement emphasizes the particular where classicism had emphasized the universal; and the development of the ego seems capable of wider reach than the development of any greatest common denominator. Like the smoke arising from the Afrit's bottle, the cloud of Hugo's personality soon overspreads the earth. "Le monde c'est moi" was in effect the cry of the Romanticists, from Rousseau down.

Among the qualities commonly attributed to French Romanticism are the following: Idealism, melancholy, liberalism or a revolt from rules, exoticism and mediævalism, the feeling for nature, the predominance of imagination, and subjectivity. To probe these a little, idealism, which begins as "enthusiasm," is not characteristic of the whole movement, and is best illustrated by the poetry of Lamartine and, on the intellectual side, by that of Vigny. The latter, however, expresses already a melancholy and bitterness ascribable to the failure of his ideals. This Romantic trait of melancholy may be partly due to the Catholic reaction, exemplified in Chateaubriand and Lamartine, which landed man again in the dilemma of dualism; even Hugo felt the sadness arising from that antagonism of flesh and spirit. Liberalism, the "Protestant" uprising in literature, followed slowly but surely upon the Revolution and the Empire. The revolt against classicism is too often predicated as the main content of the movement, which, however, possessed several more positive features. Liberalism is also associated with the spirit of adventure and personal freedom. It is natural for the Romantic to seek remoteness, in place and time, from the actual; which accounts for his invasion of the Middle Ages and many distant scenes. Local color, detailed description of the distant, is a characteristic which leads on to realism.

The fountain-head of Romanticism, though not its most shining example, is Rousseau. If we start with him, we find that he intrudes himself into everything that he treats. Sentiment and eloquence rush naturally from his pen whenever his own soul finds contact with religion or nature or woman. Religion is true only when *he* is touched, the landscape is inextricably woven with his amours, the exaltation of his fevered brain impulsively spawns forth, beyond reason and beyond taste. In imaginative surge he resembles Hugo and Balzac, and it may be that this romantic value is an essential part of the greatest creative genius—for Shakespeare had it. Finally, Rousseau is addicted to lonely revery and melancholy, the reactions of the dreamer.

A form of this malady, the *mal de René*, was launched by Chateaubriand. Here it is a question of the unappeasable longings of the individual, the frustration of his expanding desires. Where Rousseau wishes to dream of his love in sunny landscapes, Chateaubriand would plunge with her through the wrecks of time and space. A more excessive note, a wilder scenery, the revival of the Gothic and the Church, and all this stamped with the image of one proud personality—such is Chateaubriand. Lamartine follows him at a distance and sings in a tenderer strain. But he, too, uses nature as a vague large theatre, he perceives the vastness of the human soul; he, too, shows the amalgamation of Romantic elements with the predominance of personal feeling. He carries the image of Elvire into the temple, fusing sacred and profane love, or he commands the lake to be her immortal shrine. There is nothing objective in his most famous lyrics. Indeed, Romanticism is now definitely lyrical, and for years we are showered with poems of passion, of experience and revolt—all highly individualized.

These three things appear best in the effusions of Alfred de Musset, a rebel against all forms, a professor of experience and of draining life to the lees, the most inspired singer of love and youth. He, more than any other, upholds in his life and poetry the doctrine of all for love. He and George Sand offer the most startling modern "case" of the attempt to enthrone and combine passion and genius. And in proportion to the sweep and exaltation of their love, which they promenade proudly through the varied magnificence of nature and history, is the direness of its downfall. Musset incarnates that favorite Romantic type of the fallen angel; he describes the complete curve of Rominticism from idealistic ardor to a despairing finish.

The inner world is the domain of Alfred de Vigny. His compass is not great, but his thought is profound, and profoundly sad. His "ivory tower" is more like a pit in the Inferno. His constant themes are the injustice of life and the indifference of nature, because for him at least the pathetic fallacy is pathetic folly. He adds to the Romantic range the philosophical poem, the concrete symbolizing of an idea.

*See the *Nation* for April 25, 1918.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Théophile Gautier shows several of the Romantic traits, from his early Don Juanesque wildness to the finished form of "Emaux et Camées." He best represents the final paganism of the movement and the doctrine of art for art's sake. He brings in the processes of painting and interfuses various other arts, from the jeweller's to the sculptor's. The scope of his exotic tastes leads him through most of the Mediterranean countries. He is more external and impersonal than the other Romanticists.

The greatest name has been reserved for the last. Victor Hugo is the Romantic poet *par excellence*, because, what with the universality of his genius and the power of his technique, he expresses nearly every phase that has been mentioned. In his early volumes he seeks effects from the Middle Ages and the Orient. In succeeding meditations he descends into the *moi*, which he spreads over the universe in the culminating poems of his ripest years. With much sensibility and a very wide range, his greatest gift, beyond all doubt, is the force of his imagination. This declares itself in many ways: in the actual number and novelty of his images; in his power of sustained personification and vision; and particularly in his apocalyptic and awe-inspiring evocation of remote and god-like epochs. Any one who has read the "Légende des siècles" will know how Hugo creates his own mythology; such poems as the "Satyr" and the "Parricide" do not stop short of sublimity, and they seem to enlarge the actual world beyond the power of our dreams. That is the privilege of the high Romantic imagination, whether appearing in Hugo, "Hamlet," or "Faust." And Hugo's mastery of the fantastic and the gigantic is further heightened by the range of his vocabulary, his imagery, sonority, suggestiveness.

Turning to other fields, we find that in drama Hugo is again easily first. Interest also attaches to Musset's graceful Shakespearean comedies, to the huge hurly-burlies of Dumas *père*, and to the individualistic invention of the poet-martyr in Vigny's "Chatterton." But Hugo really personifies the Romantic drama in its two essential features of a wide free scope and the lyrical afflatus. The liberalizing tendencies result from the fact that the Romantic theatre was staged in deliberate opposition to the restrictions of classical tragedy, somewhat as a modern "review" may be opposed to a simple drawing-room comedy. Hence it is a question of expanding the framework in every respect: by the introduction of dozens of characters, of varied scenes, of many interests; by freeing versification from fixed trammels, by choosing subjects not merely from antiquity and the Orient, but from almost any historical age and clime; by imitating English and German rather than classical models; by importing panoramic and picturesque settings in a series of historical *tableaux;* and especially by introducing the personal note of lyrical passion and intense imaginative expression, even to excess. All of Hugo's heroines and many of the Romantic heroes exist only by virtue of their loves. Psychological depth, save of the individual kind, is often lacking, but that may be atoned for by the thrill of the poetic and theatrical effects. There is, too, a kind of Romantic universality, unlike the classical, which aims rather at thoughtful eternal generalizations; a universality which claims all "nature" as the province of artistic depiction; not only the aristocratic, but the democratic; not only the beautiful, but the "grotesque," the unbalanced and sinister. The results are often without classical repose and finish, there is much slag in the molten metal, but the divine fire is surely there.

The novel of this period follows in the main the two lines already indicated. Either it is autobiographical and intimate or it projects the author's feelings and ideas into an historical framework. The "personal novel" practically begins with the "Nouvelle Héloïse," which records the sentiments and adventures of an idealized Jean-Jacques. Madame de Staël portrays her brilliant self in "Corinne," answered by her lover's "Adolphe," in which neither Constant nor Madame de Staël appears to the best advantage. Self-depiction and analysis are also conspicuous in Châteaubriand's "René" and in Senancour's morbid "Obermann." Lamartine complacently narrates his love affairs in "Graziella" and elsewhere; so does Sainte-Beuve, more furtively, in "Volupté." But the most thorough combination of passion and personality is revealed in the novels of George Sand. In her first period ("Indiana" and "Lélia") she speaks for the misunderstood woman, whose heart is in revolt; in her later works she extends love more broadly in the direction of humanitarian dreams or of simple goodness towards one's neighbor. But, as in all the Romantic novels of passion, it is her own heart that overflows.

The historical novel was first developed by writers of this school. Following Sir Walter Scott, Vigny, Dumas, Hugo, and Balzac carry the form into France. As in their plays, it was a feature of their imaginative release to seek glory and glamour in the past. Vigny first goes after careful documentation, but his "Cinq-Mars" is almost too thoughtful and heavy-laden. The creator of the "Three Musketeers" is superficial though dramatic. Here, as elsewhere, Hugo takes the palm. His "Notre Dame de Paris" is a vast evocation of the Middle Ages, whose swarming life centres in that of the symbolic cathedral. And he shows something of the same passionate identification with his characters which appears so sympathetically later in "Les Misérables." Finally, Balzac marks the transition from the historical novel of the past ("Les Chouans") to that of the present.

History itself became romanticized. Chateaubriand and Sir Walter inspired such historians as Thierry, who combines the picturesque with true detail in his epic "Récits des temps Mérovingiens." The great example of Michelet shows the power and the danger of an imperious imagination in this domain; he is also endowed with much sentiment and strong democratic sympathies. Both of these men had the "passion of the past" and a Romantic sense of style and beauty. With them history became a thing of imaginative splendor and wide personal appeal.

To conclude, it will appear from even this limited survey that the leaders of the Romantic movement expanded literature both up and down, inward and outward. Thus they satisfied their two-fold need for experience and expression. Of them more truly than of the realists it may be said that they drew life "as seen across a temperament." It is also true that they "didn't know enough" and that their productions are not always harmonized by taste or purified by reason. Yet it remains that the three great manifestations of the French genius in literature are classicism, romanticism, realism, and it is not necessary to overpraise any one of these to the detriment of the others; each is *relatively* excellent. The Romanticists are certainly distinguished for their subjective and imaginative reach, and the free creative spirit has found few more striking monuments than that inscribed with the name of Victor Hugo.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Is a War Loan Spent?

By GEORGE A. SCHREINER

THE enormous cost of modern military operations is only imperfectly realized by the great body of Americans, despite the huge figures to which we have become accustomed during the past four years. In the period before the war we maintained an army, nominally of about 80,000 effectives, actually of considerably smaller numbers, owing to the difficulty of getting recruits; on this establishment we were spending seventy-five millions a year, at the rate of $935 per man annually. By contrast, Russia, with an annual expenditure of $250,000,000, succeeded in maintaining a standing army of 1,200,000 men; Germany, with 560,000 men, spent $150,000,000, and France, with 420,000 men, $140,000,000. Moreover, the system of conscription and reserves brought it about that the European states at the outbreak of hostilities had available forces of trained men many times larger than the numbers actually under arms. We, on the other hand, were obliged to build our armies out of untrained material.

Let us take Russia as an example of the European system. It is stated that she was able to call up an army of 12,000,000 men, well trained, despite the fact that they were poorly led. As already pointed out, she kept a standing army of 1,200,000. As the trained men left active service, they were put into the several reserves, to be recalled to the colors when war should break out. A man was in the military service from his twentieth to his forty-fifth year. The army mobilized in 1914, accordingly, was really the product of twenty-five years' training and had cost about five billion dollars. It was composed of varying age classes, with the older ones constantly losing in value. The German system had been maintained on the same principle, but at a slightly higher cost per man. The same thing is true of the French military establishment.

By comparison with European figures, and our own prewar cost of $935 per man per year, our present charges appear very high. An estimate based on the known elements of our military expenditures yields the following annual cost per capita of our whole force:

Subsistence	$430
Personal equipment	280
Service equipment	650
Pay, general average	480
Housing, cantonments, etc.	80
Transportation here and abroad	120
Total	$2,040

For that amount a man can be called to the colors and set into the trenches in France. For an army of a million men the sum of $2,040,000,000 must be spent at that rate.

Another element of enormous expenditure is ammunition. It costs no less than fifteen cents to provide an American soldier in a French trench with so small a thing as a rifle cartridge. If the man required only 400 cartridges a month, he would cost the Government $720 a year in addition, or $720,000,000 per million effectives. A machine-gun operator, however, can burn up the public money at the rate of $90 a minute. But figures such as these are trifling by comparison with the cost of artillery ammunition. Artillery in the proportion of one gun to every 400 men used to be thought the proper thing. It is a poor army nowadays that has less than one gun for every 200 men. I have been present at offensives where in given sectors they used as many as four guns for every 500 men. Unbelievable as it may appear, it has been estimated that the German artillery in the Somme offensive of 1916 used ammunition to the value of $1,800,000,000; the British and French fire cannot have been less expensive than the German. Our own expenses for munitions must be proportionately higher than the European costs; for all the guns and ammunition used by the United States must be transported thousand of miles by rail and ship.

Turn next to field transportation. An American division consists of some 20,000 men, divided as follows: 627 combatant officers, 113 non-combatant officers (surgeons and chaplains), 12 veterinarians, 17,656 effective non-commissioned officers and men, 877 non-combatant non-commissioned officers and men, and 656 civilians, employed as clerks and teamsters. To the division belong normally also 4,565 horses and 3,620 mules, the former needed to mount the cavalry units of the division and draw the 48 field pieces, and the latter to move the park of 662 escort and combat wagons and some fifty ambulances. The divisions now in France have fewer horses and mules, because motor transportation has become more general than it was three years ago; but most of the animals relieved from the supply service are now needed to move the greatly increased artillery park and the thousands of tons of ammunition.

To keep such an establishment fed, housed and clothed, and supplied with ammunition was no mean task even formerly, when very little besides food and ammunition was hauled. To this hundreds of tons of barbed wire for entanglements have now been added. Large quantities of lumber, used in revetting the trenches, flooring them, and establishing shell-proofs, must be carted to the front. Where formerly a hundred tons of ammunition were transported, two thousand tons have become the rule. Transportation in modern war is what it used to be, with tens of thousands of expensive motor trucks added.

It is perhaps unnecessary to go further in suggesting the elements of unavoidable expenditure involved in carrying on war. That it is ruinously expensive is too well known a fact to need reiteration. When we consider the vast scale on which the present struggle is carried on and the enormous distances at which our forces operate, we gain some idea of the reasons for the unexampled expenditures to which our Government is committed, and of the financial strain under which it labors. For in addition to meeting the mounting costs of training, shipping, and supplying armies containing millions of men, we are loaning billions of dollars to nations allied with us in the contest, nations whose financial strength is impaired by four years of unprecedented warfare. By taxation on a scale previously undreamed of and by loans of a magnitude hitherto considered impossible, the United States, which has become the keystone of the Allied economic arch, is providing, both for itself and in measure for the associated nations, the financial resources necessary to the successful prosecution of the struggle against Germany's militarist autocracy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Idle Waterways

By ALBERT JAY NOCK

AT the present time, with rail transportation strained to the utmost, attention is being drawn to the fact that we have a fairly complete and extremely valuable system of inland waterways so long disused that most of us are unaware of its existence. The canal preceded the railway and came under railway control, which led in most cases to its prompt abandonment. There are only 632 miles of private canals in operation in the United States; and 90 per cent. of this total is controlled by railways, and is so nearly in disuse that it may be called virtually abandoned. Formerly, for example, there were abundant water outlets by canal from the anthracite fields, such as the Delaware & Hudson, which terminated on the Hudson River at Rondout, now abandoned; the Lehigh, terminating on the Delaware; the Schuylkill, a series of short canals through slack-water sections of the Schuylkill River; the Morris Canal, connecting the Delaware River at Phillipsburg with the Hudson at Jersey City; and the old Susquehanna route along the river valley to the head of Chesapeake Bay. This system, if in working order, would have been of enormous value in the distribution of anthracite during these last two difficult years.

The Erie Canal is the most important artificial inland waterway in the United States, because it connects the Atlantic seaboard with the West. It could relieve immeasurably the enormous seasonal burden put upon the railways in the eastbound movement of bulk freight, such as wheat, corn, and oats. Yet it is practically in disuse. In 1880, competing against the privately owned railways, the canal carried nearly 8,000,000 tons of freight; during the present half-season, up to August 15, with the railways under Federal control, it has routed about 50,000 tons, or approximately one-ninth as much as was shipped during the same period last year. Only about 100 eastbound boats have left Buffalo; no wheat has been shipped, and only two boatloads of oats and eight of barley. Curiously, a great deal of the freight shipped was flour, the one commodity that is most unsuitable to water transportation, on account of its easy susceptibility to damage. The Erie Canal, with its three branches, has cost the people of New York State about $155,000,000; and the outlay on uncompleted terminals, to be constructed under the appropriation of 1911, amounts to about $20,000,000. If the canal is destined to carry only a volume of freight represented by 50,000 tons per half-season, it seems an enormous extravagance, hardly more than an ornamental folly.

The Federal Railway Administration, through its Canal Department, has done little so far to utilize our internal waterways. If the canals were taken over for the purpose of relieving congestion, they have certainly not yet been called into active service, though there seems every reason why they should be. In fact, since the Administration took hold, there has been a sharp falling off in canal freight traffic in directions where up to that time it had been fairly steady. For example, this is the first season in fifty years that ninety per cent. of the boats westbound through the Erie Canal have left New York without freight. Last spring, according to a recent issue of the *Nautical Gazette*, the Canal Department requisitioned two canalboats, which were placed under charter on May 15. The first week in June, they left Buffalo light for Rochester, where each took on 235 tons of salt for New York. Arriving, they were unloaded and held fourteen days for return cargoes of oilcake. At Waterford they were held another fortnight, waiting for a tug. They are now at Buffalo, where, up to September 4, they had not even been unloaded. Thus they had been under charter for 112 days, costing the Government eleven dollars each day for charter fees and forty cents per mile for canal towage, plus Hudson River towage, overhead, and incidentals. This, which the *Gazette* quotes as a typical case, does not show an attitude of great interest on the part of the Railway Administration in the development of water transportation. According to the same authority, the Barge Canal is hardly being utilized at all, and many inland-water craft which were formerly in regular operation between Eastern and Western points are now lying idle. "A rigorous curtailment of fuel to industries classed as non-essential," says the *Gazette*, "and a repetition of last winter's Blue Mondays threaten, yet the volume of coal carried is negligible and water carriers which might be utilized remain idly at their docks."

The foregoing figures and statements, which are in large part made up from statistics of transportation industries, are criticised as *ex parte* and inaccurate by General Wotherspoon, the State Superintendent of Public Works. According to statistics on file in his office, there was an actual increase in Erie Canal freightage this half-season of more than 80,000 tons over the season of 1916, instead of the decrease reported by the *Nautical Gazette*. Possibly this difference might be reconciled, but the final question is not after all whether the canal carries so many tons of freight more or less in a given season, but whether there is any indication of a comprehensive general policy of bringing freight transportation by waterways up to the capacity of our existing system and of an energetic continuous enlargement of the system.

Probably before long the Railway Administration will establish such a policy. Recent announcement is made of the appointment of Mr. G. A. Tomlinson as head of the new Canal Section, and though he has had largely a railway experience, it must be assumed until proved otherwise that he is interested in water transportation and disposed to give it fair play. The Railway Administration is composed chiefly of railway men, and no doubt its hands have been pretty full. While its neglect of water transportation, therefore, may not be set down to traditional prejudice, still it may not even yet be quite aware of the part that our waterways might play in the solution of many railway problems. The whole experience of the Administration personnel is such as to make them regard canal systems with disfavor, as something to be got rid of, by one means or another, as quickly as possible. When the railways were privately owned, this feeling was understandable. Water competition was a dangerous menace to revenue and had to be suppressed. If after the war the railways are to be restored to private ownership, it is also understandable that with this prospect in mind the railway-trained men who compose the Administration should hesitate about going very far to put a policy of water transportation on its feet. But, after all, transportation, whether by rail or water, is service; and what the country most needs now is effective service, service viewed as service and not as a source of dividends. Mr. McAdoo's executive heads might profitably

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

study the relations of rail and water transportation in European countries. The German and Dutch railways, for example, and to almost as great an extent the French and English lines, move hardly a pound of low-grade freight. In a country provided with natural waterways like ours, it would require relatively little artificial auxiliary construction to bring us to the point where we should have no excuse for permitting our railways to carry it. There is no reason now why they should carry anthracite coal to the seaboard if the existing channels of water communication were restored; certainly no reason why they should carry soft coal through the valleys of the Ohio, Allegheny, Monongahela, Mississippi, and Missouri. As it is, however, they carry not only coal, but ore, grain, timber, steel, stone, heavy machinery—they carry everything that they should not and would not need to carry if our interest in the possibilities of water transportation were not stagnant. Transportation is the first essential service of modern life, and no facility for improving it should be neglected. Roads, railways, and waterways all have their logical place, and there is no such thing as over-development among them. It was a pound-foolish policy for the railways ever to have driven out the canals; the more business each made for itself, the more it would have made for the other. There is a natural and simple division of function among the road, the railway, and the waterway, and no natural interference. It is to be hoped that Mr. McAdoo will make this division as distinct as it has been for years in Europe, and that such a policy may remain in force long enough to impress the public with an effective sense of its advantages.

International Mindedness

THE International Relations section of the *Nation*, whose publication as a fortnightly supplement begins with the present issue, has both a particular and a general purpose. On its formal side it aims to present, on a more extended scale than the plan and scope of the *Nation* have hitherto made possible, such material as will enable the intelligent and thoughtful reader, and especially the American reader, to form an accurate and unbiassed judgment of international questions. Each issue will contain, among other features, informing articles on subjects of international interest by writers, in foreign countries as well as in the United States, who are entitled to speak with authority in their several fields; important documents of which complete or accurate English texts have not hitherto been readily available, or to which the progress of events gives significance at the moment; extracts from editorials or other articles showing the trend of opinion in the foreign press, including, by permission of the Federal Government, the press of Germany and Austria-Hungary; and news items of importance from countries throughout the world. In each of these directions the International Relations section will fill a place which has not thus far been appropriated by any American journal.

The formal side of the undertaking, however, constitutes the least of the services which, it is hoped, the International Relations section will render. It is indeed necessary that the American public should be informed; but the mere presentation of information, however skilful or comprehensive, will be of small serviceableness if the knowledge of what is being thought, said, or done in the world is not translated into an intelligent and vivid interest in what is taking place, in the problems which are presented, and in the solutions which are offered or attempted. The grave and difficult international issues which the war has raised, and which will continue to engross us long after the conflict at arms has ceased, can be dealt with wisely by those peoples only who develop the international mind, who look at world situations from the world standpoint and in the light of world knowledge, and to whom the welfare of the province or the nation is only a phase of the larger welfare of mankind.

How varied and commanding these world issues are, we in America have begun in the past four years dimly to perceive. No nation anywhere, perhaps, has as yet fully grasped their nature or their possibilities. But for the United States, thrust as it has been in a brief period into the very centre of a world struggle, the task of intellectual and moral adjustment to a new world order is peculiarly great. It is no will to power that has made us to-day, more at least than any other nation, the determining factor in the great decisions that must now be made; rather is it the inevitable result of our numbers, our wealth, our enthusiasm, and the drawing power of circumstances which no nation can in the last analysis control. All the more, therefore, do we owe it to ourselves and to the world to broaden the range of our interests, to store our minds with sifted facts, to weigh impartially arguments and pleas, to see the world truly at the same time that we see it whole.

The *Nation* professes no exceptional wisdom that would enable it to frame a comprehensive programme for the tangled mass of issues which make up the rushing current of the world that is to be, nor has it the gift of prophecy. In the world events, as in the multitude of voices which announce how the stream should be curbed and directed, it must seek for truth as best it may. For some things, however, it stands and for some it hopes. It stands with President Wilson for the right of nations everywhere, the small as well as the great, to choose their way of life and of obedience. It stands with President Lincoln for all that will achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations. It stands for open diplomacy, for the greatest possible freedom of international trade and intercourse, for the liberty of the press and of opinion, and for honesty, justice, and sympathy in all international dealings. It hopes for unity among the nations—a unity which, whether embodied in any formal organization or not, will foster sympathy and good understanding, break down provincial prejudice and hate, facilitate intellectual interchange, abolish militarism, assure to all who labor the just fruits of their toil, and make the world, in whatsoever part, a happy place to live in. If the International Relations section shall prove to have contributed to the attainment of such ends as these, it will have fulfilled the purpose which those who have planned it have had in mind.

Contributors to this Issue

FRANK G. MOORHEAD is a journalist of Des Moines, Iowa.

E. PRESTON DARGAN is associate professor of French literature in the University of Chicago.

GEORGE A. SCHREINER has studied the Great War as correspondent on all the European battle fronts.

E. W. CLEMENT and J. A. STEVENSON are correspondents of the *Nation* in Tokio and Ottawa respectively.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Vision*

By WILLIS BOYD ALLEN

THROUGH wreaths of morning mist, and sulphurous drift
Of battle-smoke, afar I dimly see
A mighty form, from ancient gyves set free,
And roused from restless sleep; her face uplift
To greet the new-born day, while through a rift
Between the lowering clouds gleams fitfully
The golden promise of a life to be—
Of sunlit Freedom, heaven's most radiant gift.

O Russia, long enslaved, lethargic, dazed
With liberty undreamed-of, still amazed
At thine own power: soon shalt thou stand erect,
A Nation strong, puissant to protect
Thy loyal sons throughout their vast domain;
Thy trust in God; thine honor without stain!

Foreign Correspondence

The Voice of Japanese Democracy

Tokio, August 20

"THE Voice of Japanese Democracy"† is the striking title of a book which has just been issued. The essay is translated from the Japanese of Hon. Y. Ozaki, M. P., who has been a member of the House of Representatives without a break since the first session (1890), has served a long term as Mayor of Tokio, has twice been a member of the Cabinet under Okuma, and has always been an earnest champion of liberal ideas. The translator, Mr. J. E. de Becker, is a leading member of the Yokohama bar, and a master of the Japanese language. Each chapter closes with a quotation from the poems of the late Emperor Meiji. In some cases, these verses are strikingly apposite.

Mr. Ozaki says that the two principal causes of the perpetuity of the Japanese Imperial line are mystic, or divine, and human, but he treats only the latter. And he sums up the human causes in the following sentence:

> Their essence lies in the conformity of the will of the sovereign with the sentiments of the people. . . . The sovereign has no mind of his own; the mind of the people is his mind, and on this principle our successive Emperors have acted.

Then Mr. Ozaki establishes the following statement as the fundamental point of his argument:

> Their essence lies in the conformity of the will of the sovertaining the trend of public opinion and popular sentiment by means of mechanical or institutional (leg l) means with a view to the establishment of a state of unanimity between the will of the sovereign and the sentiments of the people.

And in the following chapter he adds concerning the constitutional system that "from the viewpoint of the sovereign the system is a means of ascertaining the sentiments of the people, while from the viewpoint of the people it is a means of exercising a right."

In discussing the party Cabinet system, Mr. Ozaki emphasizes the point that such a system is "more expedient to secure complete harmony between sovereign and subjects and better calculated to give effect to the Imperial desire to decide affairs of state in accordance with public opinion"; and he affirms that party government is a necessary adjunct of constitutional government. He insists that a political party is an index of public opinion. He points out that during the more than thirty years which have elapsed since the adoption of a Cabinet system in Japan (1885), Marquises Okuma and Saionji have been the only Prime Ministers not of Satsuma or Choshiu extraction, so that it has been a period of clan government. And then he confronts the clan opponents of party government with the following arraignment:

> If they persist in affirming that party government is restrictive of the supreme powers [of the Emperor], they are also bound to admit that clan government is more so and that it is injurious to the honor and dignity of the Imperial House to a still greater degree. Otherwise they are illogical and inconsistent.

Mr. Ozaki draws the distinction between the system of individual appointment and responsibility of Cabinet Ministers, which is "the essence of bureaucratic government," and that of joint appointment and responsibility, "the essence of party government." He also makes this striking assertion: "Our Cabinet system is one of the most advanced in the whole world and far surpasses the present German system." In the next chapter he speaks thus of Japan and England: "Though these two Empires differ entirely in point of national organization, yet they closely resemble each other in the harmonious union existing between sovereign and subjects."

Mr. Ozaki does not fail to recognize "the rampancy of the military clique and the inequality of the civil and military services" in Japan. He says, for instance, concerning the present political stage in Japan, that it is "not one which has been arranged for the statesmen of the Empire in general, but for those politicians who represent certain clan cliques and the bureaucracy." And he adds: "What I hope and struggle for is a stage on which all Japanese subjects can alike enjoy the same facilities."

He also recognizes four existing defects of Japanese political parties, as follows:

> (1) Little importance is attached to principles and political views; (2) they are too deeply affected by historic and sentimental considerations; (3) they are apt to lose sight of their main object in their eagerness to be uppermost; (4) they are, as political parties, devoid of the sense of justice.

He acknowledges that "we have had the conception of a faction, but none of a public party." And he shows how the clan clique still manages to retain political power "by skilfully playing them [parties] one against the other." He also points out that the idea of political parties germinates and grows according to feudal notions" in Japan:

> Political parties, which should be based and dissolved solely on principle and political views, are really affairs of personal connections and sentiments, the relations between the leader and the members of a party being similar to those which subsisted between a feud l lord and his liegemen.

Mr. Ozaki deplores the narrow, insular, chauvinistic views maintained by many, and the proud and complacent attitude of the "upstart millionaires" (known as *narikin* in Japanese) and contrasts such conditions with the self-sacrificing loyalty and patriotic *noblesse oblige* of the British people, high

*Suggested by a strong piece of sculpture called "Russia Awakening," recently modelled by Miss Baschka Paeff.

†Yokohama: Kelly & Walsh; $2.50 net.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and low. He quotes the ancient saw, "Pride invites loss and humility is rewarded by gain," and affirms that it is a maxim applicable not to individuals only, but to nations also; and he urges a still more progressive national policy.

The book is really significant. Mr. Ozaki is one of the most persistent and consistent of the liberal leaders. It must be said that Japanese statesmen are not famous for their courageous advocacy of principle, but are addicted to compromise, in the art of which they are past masters. In this essay Mr. Ozaki is fearless in advocating a kind of democracy, a certain amount of democratic processes, as conducive to the highest type of loyalty to the Emperor. His voice of Japanese democracy is not the voice of one crying in the wilderness; it is rather the voice of one proclaiming from the housetops a new gospel of loyalty; it is a trumpet call to every one to strengthen the bonds which bind the nation to the Imperial Throne. "The Voice of Japanese Democracy" expresses the ideal of constitutional loyalty.

ERNEST W. CLEMENT

In the Driftway

BLESS the Rumanian Crown Prince! In the midst of war without end, poverty, sickness, sufferings beyond description, he brings us back to the eternal verities through his love affair with a pretty little commoner—she must be both pretty and little, or surely she could not merit so self-sacrificing a royal lover. It was Justin McCarthy who made François Villon declare that if he were king he would give to his love the moon and the stars to play with, and the earth for a finger-ring. But this heir to a kingdom who might have offered a throne for a plaything tosses it aside if need be to win his inamorata. Thrones are so unstable, he says, he would not relinquish his romance for the right to succeed to something that may not exist when the time to succeed arrives. Wise prince! It was the Kaiser of Austria who said the other day that these were days when kings must hang together—or else, he might have plagiarized, they will hang separately. When the kings themselves know that the king business is near an end; when princes like the Rumanian and one of the Kaiser's sons follow the prompting of their hearts, even to the forfeiting of rank, who shall say that democracy is not coming into its own?

* * * * *

The most amusing feature of the holding up of the *Nation* for September 14 was furnished by Deputy Attorney-General Alfred L. Becker, of New York. This official, who was very handsomely defeated for the Republican nomination for Attorney-General by an intelligent electorate at the recent primary, had been keeping himself very much in the public eye by useful and often sensational revelations concerning pernicious German activities, which fitted in obviously, or were made to fit in, with his political ambitions. Believing apparently that he might thereby curry favor with Washington after the news of the questioning of the *Nation* appeared, Mr. Becker hastened to give out an affidavit from a willing interned alien that the *Nation* was the most popular journal among all the interned Germans. Only a few copies, he admitted, went to the camps, but there was always a line waiting for each copy. Unfortunately for Mr. Becker and his veracious affiant, Washington, in the person of Mr. Wilson, decided in favor of the *Nation,* leaving both the affiant and the obsequious official looking extremely ridiculous. Had Mr. Becker been seeking the truth alone, he could readily have ascertained at this office by telephone that the *Nation* has exactly two subscribers in the internment camps, one of them of only a few weeks' standing. But why stop for facts or a mere matter of justice when there is an opportunity for a place for a defeated politician on the first page of our dailies?

* * * * *

The war may be working profound and revolutionary changes in English life, but there are certain British characteristics that war cannot alter. I venture to say that not even if the Germans had taken London in the first rush of the war could anything have interfered with the custom of afternoon tea and the complete suspension of all business in London offices while this solemn function is going on. Still another British habit, that of climbing high mountains, has not been relinquished because of the chaos in Europe, as is shown by the following dispatch:

> ZERMATT, August 24.—Major A. C. Morrison Bell, M.P., accompanied by the guides Hartmann Perren and Heinrich Koenig, has made the ascent of the Dom and Taeschorn, in the Mischabel chain, returning the same day by the difficult ridge of the Teufelsgrat.—[Reuter.

I presume that Major Bell is only one of many who spend a short leave from the front in risking their lives on the eternal snows of hospitable little Switzerland, and I look forward at any moment to a news dispatch that some officers on leave from General Allenby's force have followed in James Bryce's footsteps and climbed Mount Ararat. Britons not only never shall be slaves, but they will never—thank fortune!—relinquish the wholesome sports and love of adventure which have done so much to make them the great nation they are.

* * * * *

George M. La Monte, one of the three candidates for the Democratic Senatorial nomination in New Jersey, who have so nearly tied for the nomination that the soldier vote will decide, is a cousin of Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Company. It is only a few years since the candidate changed the spelling of his name to the old French form. A warm supporter of Woodrow Wilson, from the time he entered politics in New Jersey, Mr. La Monte served most acceptably for several years as Banking and Insurance Commissioner. At times one of Governor Wilson's intimates, he has also had the usual experience of most of those intimates, in finding himself at times extremely remote from the seats of the mighty. But his belief in the future of a reformed Democratic party has never waned; if others as well off and public spirited had labored as hard for his State, that reform would be much nearer. He made very little effort to obtain the nomination in the campaign just ended—his is not an aggressive personality, nor is he a forceful speaker. But when one thinks of the late Senator Hughes and ex-Senator "Jim" Martine, the election of Mr. La Monte would mean a wonderful toning up of New Jersey's representation and bring to the Senate a man whom everybody would like and respect and listen to with satisfaction, but the chances are that Governor Edge, the successful Republican candidate, will walk off with the prize.

THE DRIFTER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Radicalism and American Labor

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Several of the liberal and radical weekly journals are greatly displeased with the American Federation of Labor and its present leaders, especially Mr. Gompers. The more they contemplate the British Labor party, the more disappointed and angry are they with the leaders of the American movement.

Why is there no American Labor party? Why has not Mr. Gompers joined the bold, fearless, brave assailants of the whole present social and economic order? These are in reality the questions the radical journals would be putting and discussing if they were quite candid. As it is, they use ambiguous and somewhat Pickwickian phrases about the "complacency" of American labor leaders towards the present iniquitous social order, and the strange, deplorable backwardness and obscurantism of the American labor movement.

I write as a social radical of the individualist school. I believe that fundamental economic and political changes are necessary, desirable, and certain. I believe in equality of liberty and opportunity, and, therefore, in the abolition of all anti-social, oppressive monopoly and artificial, unjust privilege. I should rejoice if the American labor movement were fully prepared to take the same position and apply it to land, money, trade, and taxation. But I can see little reason or fairness in the present attacks, open or covert, on the American trade-union movement or on its leadership. It is unphilosophical and unscientific to complain of the fact that the leaders of organized labor in America are not Socialists, or Syndicalists, or Single-Taxers, or consistent Individualists. It is simply foolish to scold them for being what they are and holding the opinions they hold.

The real and important questions are these: Are the labor leaders laggards, perverse obstructionists, barnacles? Are the rank and file of organized labor more advanced than the leaders are? If the present leaders are the natural and fit representatives of the rank and file, then assaults on the leaders are at bottom assaults on the millions behind them. The hard, stubborn fact is that the average American wage-worker is conservative and opportunist, not radical. The old, "narrow" trade-union formula, "A good day's wage for a good day's work," satisfies him. He is willing to organize, to strike, to respond to an appeal for a boycott. He favors—rather mildly—certain forms of restrictive and regulative legislation. He will support child-labor bills, bills limiting women's hours of toil, compensation for accidents, and the like. But he is not a social radical. He is not "class conscious." The British Labor reconstruction programme is far too socialistic for him. He does not share either the interest of the American intellectual radical of the Socialist or the Single Tax school in that remarkable manifesto. Radicals should learn to see things as they are, to see life steadily and see it whole.

There is no American Labor party simply and solely because the time is not ripe for it. The average American wage-worker may join a union, but he will not leave the political party with which he is affiliated. He sees no necessity for such a step. He gets concessions and recognition from the political machines and bosses, and he is satisfied. This being the case, indictments and lamentations are idle and a little ridiculous.

The really thoughtful and evolutional observer, no matter how radical in thought and speculation, will admit in his sober moments that American conditions, traditions, and habits of thought fully account for the conservatism of the American wage-worker, and that there is nothing astonishing, mysterious, or deplorable in the phenomenon. America is new and young. America has been and still is strongly individualistic. America has meant boundless and equal opportunities. Free land is more than a memory even now. Land is still cheap and abundant, relatively if not absolutely. The American does not relish regulation and regimentation. He is too near the pioneer stage of development.

A people cannot and will not shake off in a dozen years the habits, principles, and ideas by which several generations lived wholesomely and naturally. True, our industrial conditions are changing, and in the course of events the average American workman will modify his ideas. An American Labor party will doubtless appear on the stage in the fulness of time. The platform of that party will borrow much, but not all, from the British Labor platform. America will not think in European, Old-World terms for decades to come, if ever. No scientific student of history and legislation will expect this. Legislation grows out of realized needs and conditions, not out of the fond dreams and noble aspirations of a few seers and reformers.

The trouble with many of the would-be mentors and guides of American labor is that they read too much British, Australian, and German socialist, semi-socialist, and reform literature, and hastily apply the knowledge gained therefrom to American problems and situations. They are not in any vital touch with American labor; they do not really know how the American trade-unionist or workman thinks and feels and talks. Actual contact with labor would correct and modify many of their academic ideas. But, instead of mingling and living with labor, the doctrinaire radicals attend an occasional conference of labor delegates, hear sentiments that seem to them reactionary, and rush into radical print with severe criticisms of the leaders of American labor. This is not the enlightened way to "coöperate with evolution."

VICTOR S. YARROS

Chicago, July 31

English Food Control Again

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Last month's record of the prosecutions in England for infringement of food-control rules contains some interesting items. Samuel Gold, baker of Stepney, was fined $250 for making white bread. The 214 loaves he had made were confiscated and sent to London Hospital. John Brookes, a farmer near Falmouth, was fined $100 for feeding some wheat flour to pigs. A small-town grocer was fined $250 for not displaying the official bacon prices in his shop. A hoarder who had accumulated 33 pounds of sugar, 22 pounds of tea, 25 pounds of rice, and 20 pounds of beef dripping was fined $125 and costs. A farmer of Black Isle was fined $100 "for failing to take reasonable precautions against rats, mice, rooks, and jackdaws, whereby twelve stacks of oats and barley were partially rendered unfit for human food."

Food control is no jest, for either mice or men, in England!

VERNON KELLOGG

Washington, D. C., September 6

The National Security League

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me to thank you for the article on the National Security League in your issue of September 21. I for one believe that unless its methods are radically changed its work is likely to do more harm than good. There are many good Americans who believe that certain influential members of the League are a menace to our effort to bring out of this war results really useful to humanity. Their disposition to characterize as "pro-German" every effort that looks to liberal discussion has already weakened a charge which is the most insulting epithet that can now be applied in this country. Their use of it in describing men of the highest patriotism and most generous ideals reacts upon themselves where the facts are known, thanks to such articles as yours, but the facts are often not known; and then charges backed by such an organization amount to little less than a public menace. Hundreds of people have supported the League both as contributors and as officers who have been actuated by the highest possible ideals; many of them have permitted its methods to go unreproved because they thought it necessary to ignore minor errors because of the good the League could do. There seems now to be approaching, however, a time when the balance between good and harm may make it necessary for the directors of the League to examine its methods more carefully.

EDGAR DAWSON

Hunter College, September 22

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Shakespearean Researches

The Original Version of "Love's Labour's Lost," with a Conjecture as to "Love's Labour's Won." By Henry David Gray. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press.

THE earliest version of "Love's Labour's Lost" is the quarto of 1598, the title-page of which carries the statement, "As it was presented before her Highness this last Christmas. Newly corrected and augmented. By W. Shakespere." There is evidence that the play as first written was one of the earliest of Shakespeare's, dating about 1590; and indications of revision are to be found in the duplication of two passages and in the disproportionate length of the last act. Various speculations have been made as to the separation of the original of 1590 from the revision of 1597.

A natural eagerness to protect Shakespeare from himself has led to the assumption that the superior passages belong to the additions and that the inferior and trivial portions go to the original. But there is very little in the play which does any great credit to the Shakespeare of 1597, and a truer piety might hesitate to believe that there is anything which he could not have written in 1590. Professor Gray goes considerably beyond preceding critics in reducing the merit of the original version; but he thereby leaves us somewhat dissatisfied with the reviser. If Shakespeare in 1597 really changed and added so much, including Holofernes and Nathaniel, why didn't he do a good deal better? It is difficult to see why Shakespeare added all "the finest and most vital portions of the drama," when, as Professor Gray says, they are "confusing and distorting elements which have obscured the true character" of the play.

Professor Gray has recently made a number of studies of additions, interpolations, and revisions in Shakespeare, and this monograph is an example of the most careful and ingenious practice of this kind of research. It may therefore be taken not unfairly as illustrating some of the difficulties and dangers which are involved in such conjectural remaking of Shakespeare.

Resting on the plausible assumption that the revision was mostly in the last two acts, the argument begins with the duplicated passages and takes the longer versions as typical of the style of the revision. Soon a number of other passages are garnered which seem likewise superior in style or serious in tone. Among these is the series of quatrains, IV, iii, 221–280. The earlier portion of this passage is excellent, the latter portion trivial, but this must be kept for the revision because here Rosaline is spoken of as dark, while in III, i, 198, she is "a whitely wanton." It would seem that a brunette might be pale as well as a blonde, but such inconsistencies introduce another important criterion for the critic. The accumulation of passages for the revision now proceeds on this argument: (1) All superior passages belong there, (2) also all trivial passages that are inconsistent with other trivial passages, (3) also all passages that are congruous with (1) or (2).

The most novel part of Professor Gray's analysis lies in the denial to the original of any of the scenes in which Holofernes appears. This conclusion is within the range of possibilities, but it is reached only by making the most favorable use possible of an inconsistency. When the Clown introduces the show of the Nine Worthies in V, ii, he speaks of "the three worthies" and explains that "Everyone presents three." But when the performers come in, there are five, though the King first counts them as four. Here is a clue, and Professor Gray concludes that in the original version there were only three performers. This might throw Holofernes and Nathaniel over to the additions. We next go back to the preceding scene (V, i), where Holofernes is preparing for the show. This must be an addition, too, and by an ingenious reading of the Quarto Professor Gray detects Shakespeare making over the pageant from three to five performers. To be sure, Holofernes does say, "I will play three myself," which is in accord with the original, and even after Shakespeare got it revised, the scene is still inconsistent with the performance in the next scene. One inconsistency may show that Shakespeare did not remember from scene i to scene ii; another inconsistency may show that he did not remember from 1590 to 1597; the critic must decide which is which. Having now got two scenes with Holofernes and Nathaniel out of the original version, it is easy to dispose of what remains of those worthies in IV, ii. Here there is little that is in the style of the maturer pen, but the device of having Biron's letter read here instead of in the next scene after the sonnets of the other traitors, where any schoolboy would have put it, seems to be the work of the mature Shakespeare. Professor Gray is quite sure "that the young poet who built this drama in the first instance intended to have this scene of the reading of the love poems capped and completed by the reading of Biron's sonnet." Thus Holofernes and Nathaniel are denied to the Shakespeare of 1590, aged twenty-six, and are assigned as personal caricatures devised seven years later.

This method of remaking Shakespeare is a fascinating pursuit, not unlike the children's game of building a tower out of blocks. The sympathetic reader watches the second block rest neatly and safely on the first, and shares the critic's exhilaration as conjecture piles on conjecture with only a slight trembling of the edifice. The difficulty with the game is that you can never stop and so always lose. As one inference makes possible another, the critic cannot refrain from adding one block too many—and then even the sympathetic reader begins to consider what slight support there was for all this painful building. The block too many in this case is the postscript "Conjecture as to Love's Labour's Won." On top of the simple and symmetrical original version derived from the unwieldy "Love's Labour's Lost" Professor Gray adds a similarly and equally immature "Love's Labour's Won" derived from "Twelfth Night."

That Shakespeare's revision of "Love's Labour's Lost" was hasty and consisted in part in improving and enlarging various speeches in the last act seems fairly certain. Beyond this, conjecture has little support. As we go on step by step, removing this and that, and finally all of Holofernes from the original, the result is a play too simply symmetrical, too feebly Lylian for Shakespeare at twenty-six or even at twenty-four. There would be the possibility of discovering similarly restricted originals in all plays that show any inconsistencies, if only you could go on piling up conjectures indefinitely. The reader who does not accept Professor Gray's conclusions will, however, find enjoyment and profit in many portions of his study, which is characterized by the most careful and sympathetic scrutiny of the play itself and of its various commentators.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New Biography of Girard

The Life and Times of Stephen Girard, Mariner and Merchant. Two volumes. By John Bach McMaster. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. $5 net per set.

A GOOD biography of Stephen Girard would certainly be an addition to American historical literature. Professor McMaster has felt the need and explored the immense body of manuscript material which somehow has been submitted to his use. He does not tell us where this material is nor indicate how other scholars might gain access to it. That it is particularly full and covers pretty closely the commercial and economic relations of two very critical periods of our history, the Revolution and the War of 1812, is made evident on almost every page of this work.

There have been other attempts at biographies of Girard. Stephen Simpson published such a work in 1832. In 1860 Henry W. Arey printed his story of "Girard College and its Founder," and about 1880 Walter R. Houghton brought out a big volume on "Kings of Fortune," in which a sketch of Girard appeared. Still, none of these books gives any adequate idea of that severe and peculiar character who was the subject of nation-wide discussion during the last thirty years of his life. He was a miser, a note-shaver, a hard taskmaster, a conscienceless money-maker to some people; to others he was a philanthropist, a public-spirited citizen, and an ardent American.

It is Professor McMaster's business to set the man before us, show how he made a great fortune in times of utmost difficulty for others, what public services he rendered, and how, at last, he came to make that unique will which set all the tongues of the country wagging afresh at the time of his death in 1831. From this new "Life" one gathers with some difficulty that Girard set up for himself very early, that he left his father and friends in Bordeaux embarrassed because of debts which he was not in a hurry to pay, that he became an important merchant and trader and put several ships upon the ocean, formed a partnership with his brother, expanded his trade to the West Indies, to all the ports of western Europe, and made large profits from the early commerce with China. He set up a bank for himself in Philadelphia with a capital of more than a million dollars at the beginning of the War of 1812, fought the other banks of the city, and labored hard and long to prevent the enactment by the State of Pennsylvania of legislation hostile to him; he appealed to the Federal Government for aid and received it, subscribed three millions of the capital of the Second National Bank when it was established in 1816, and at last gave the public most of an estate which amounted to about seven million dollars.

These are the principal facts that one gleans from these two volumes of ill-digested excerpts from the vast correspondence which Girard left. The hero does not seem to have been so bad as some men have thought. He seldom refused to give handsomely to his relatives in France, and those relatives were frequently in need. He did not, it seems, derive a large sum from the sale of silver and other treasure left in his ships by the panic-stricken planters of San Domingo who were slaughtered by their slaves. Just how he did earn his wealth Professor McMaster does not make plain. The author's aim seems to be to let Girard tell his own story, and we have page after page of quotations from his letters, now of instructions to ship captains, now of descriptions of market conditions or ship losses. Only a necessitous student will, one might venture to predict, ever read five chapters consecutively.

Yet one sees that Girard was a dramatic character, the centre of the economic life of Philadelphia for a quarter of a century, the adviser of the Government in war time, and a devoted friend of the stricken poor whenever yellow fever made its terrible visitations to his city. He was the correspondent and friend of Gallatin, of A. J. Dallas, of John Jacob Astor, of the Baring Brothers; a friend and benefactor of many French refugees, the intimate counsellor of the famous General Grouchy and Joseph Bonaparte.

That Girard was not merely a money-getter is plainly evidenced in his long quarrel with the medical authorities about the epidemics of yellow fever. Having lived in the West Indies, he was convinced that he knew what yellow fever was and that the plague of 1793, 1798, and 1820, which carried off so many Philadelphians, was not yellow fever. He defied the epidemic, continued at his work in a neighborhood where many were stricken, took patients into his own house and nursed them, helped set up a hospital for the afflicted, and spent much of his time within its walls. He could scarcely restrain his anger when Dr. Rush and boards of health warned the people against the dread disease. Three times in his life he made this fight against "Our Board of Health, our College of Physicians, or rather jackasses [who] do not show the common-sense of a half civilized nation [and] have created an unparalleled state of alarm" (I, 345).

Another quality of mind or profession of faith in the great merchant was his devotion to what he called republicanism, what we should call democracy. He hated the social and economic reaction which culminated in the Federal Constitution, although he was not, so far as appears in these volumes, actually opposed to the early national Government. He took part in Philadelphia politics, and the followers of Jefferson relied on his strong box on more than one occasion. When the famous Thomas Cooper was fined four hundred dollars for violating the Sedition law and was thrust into jail, Girard secretly paid the fine. McMaster brings out for the first time a letter of Cooper, dated 1831, thanking the banker for paying the fine.

Once during the long wars against Napoleon, Girard let fall an impatient remark, which may have been the remark of the irritated merchant. It would tend to show how deeply he felt for the masses of struggling men who, he said, never had any voice in the questions of war or peace. And they who suffer most, he wrote a friend in Europe, and who would of themselves never make wars, were never consulted about the beginning of hostilities. Yet he owned a plantation in Louisiana and thirty or more slaves, who did his work there. He held indentured servants nearly all his life in Philadelphia, and once, when one of them ran away, he employed lawyers and sent out special agents to scour the country in order to bring him back.

These two volumes, then, make a good source book of American history. Unfortunately they do not give us the careful, connected, and analytical biography which we had a right to expect. They do not answer definitely any of the questions which one must ask about Girard; nor does the sturdy old man stand out very much clearer on our historical horizon than he did before. Why so great a scholar as McMaster left an important book and a great opportunity thus only half-exploited is a question for the reader.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Spargo's Socialism

Social Democracy Explained: Theories and Tactics of Modern Socialism. By John Spargo. New York: Harper & Brothers. $1.50 net.

Americanism and Social Democracy. By John Spargo. New York: Harper & Brothers. $1.50 net.

WHEN the St. Louis Socialist Convention, in April, 1917, asserted of our declaration of war, "In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage," the party lost what hold it had on the mass of the American people, and only shortly thereafter the daily press recorded the resignation of Mr. John Spargo from the party of which he had long been a leader, but in which he was always a man somewhat apart. That party, instead of relating its propaganda and policies to American life and defects, had long maintained sterile dogmas based on mid-European conditions and experiences, and Mr. Spargo, reared in England and coming to this country with the dawning of the century, had long chafed at its Prussian discipline. He now places before the country an interpretation of Socialism which he believes in consonance with our needs.

His explanation of "Social Democracy," however, was written before the outbreak of the European war. While the first chapters are labored, towards the end the style becomes not only simpler, but even fluent and persuasive. Though the author subscribes himself a Marxian, he is the reverse of doctrinaire. He modifies the theory of class-struggle, so that the proletariat includes the whole nation except the relatively small group of capitalists and large land-holders. Concerning another cardinal doctrine of Marx, the theory of concentration, he finds himself in company with Bernstein, Vollmar, and David in believing that the middle class is not disappearing, and may even increase. He is convinced that the general strike cannot succeed, and apparently nothing could swerve him from the conclusion that sabotage is disastrous, because it destroys the moral fibre of the man practicing it. The simple Marxian formulas of social evolution have not blinded Mr. Spargo to actual developments here. He has deepened his knowledge of economic progress by testing the application of cherished theories. The result is not only a clear, but an unusually well-grounded explanation of Socialist theories.

The volume on "Americanism," which has for the most part been written this year, is an interesting reflection of the influence of the war on radical opinion. Mr. Spargo cannot think of the Socialist party as anything but "reactionary and stupid." All the documents in his warfare on its policy are collected in an appendix whose fulness and impartiality will make it more valuable with the lapse of time. His ardent belief that "the ideals of true democratic Socialism are identical with Americanism" does not render him content with actual America. On the contrary, the greater part of the volume is taken up with the programme of the new National party. His proposals demonstrate how much easier it is to wield the pen of the critic than to wear the toga of the statesman. We are near enough to agreement on ideals; what we need is a clear path to the attainment of ideals under present American conditions. In surrendering the essential Socialist demand for the abolition of the wage-system, or at least contenting himself with an indefinite continuance of it, Mr. Spargo dulls the biting edge of the Socialist theory as a tool of agitation. While he presents to the practical citizen a pacifying exposition of that theory, he provides him with no thread to lead him out of our industrial labyrinth.

England in the Seven Years' War

England in the Seven Years' War: A Study in Combined Strategy. By Sir Julian S. Corbett. New York: Longmans, Green & Company. Two volumes. $7.00.

THIS reprint of a standard work, first published in 1907, presents a stirring picture of what may be termed the middle phase (1756-1763) of the struggle between Great Britain and France for maritime and colonial supremacy which lasted, with longer or shorter interruptions, for a century and a quarter. As one studies the details of the process by which the fatal error of the French policy of those times, in seeking simultaneously to dominate the continent of Europe while striving to uphold a mastery on the seas, was utilized by the British fleet, cooperating with the Prussian army, to weaken the Gallic dominion, the thought of the mutability of international alliances as recorded in history cannot fail to rise in the reader's mind. It seems hardly credible, indeed, that countries so closely joined in spirit and action should ever have been enemies in a contest so fierce and resolute, to which ultimately but one ending was possible—the absolute triumph of the power that held the mastery of the ocean. Yet ever since European wars became world-wide in their extension this truth has been apparent, and the present conflict has demonstrated it anew. However different, furthermore, the relations of offence and defence among the several belligerents, however different the scenes and circumstances then and now, no dust of antiquarianism rises from the pages of the volumes; for what they relate is full of the same elemental human traits and achievements, the same play of calculation and chance, the same matching of strategy and diplomacy, which mark the movements of forces by sea and land to-day in an age of steel and steam and machinery, albeit in those times the vessels were wooden, the propellant was wind, and the enginery but a rude contrivance.

The colorful account written by the foremost living British naval historian describes in a wealth of detail, drawn from records still largely in manuscript, the course of the conflict, beginning with the diplomatic revolution that followed the close of the War of the Austrian Succession and ending with the treaty of Paris, which gave to Britain what once had been a French empire in America and assured its dominance of India. As might be expected, the political and military episodes are kept fairly subordinate to the necessity of showing the effectiveness of a fleet that facilitated operations on land, protected commerce, destroyed enemy squadrons, and rendered possible the seizure of distant territory. Since no mere narration of the exploits of the British navy would convey an adequate idea of the conditions that had to be met and mastered, the strategic factors are examined at considerable length, but in language so free from technicalities that the layman has little trouble in understanding their significance. The reprint is a service to all who find interest in reflecting upon comparisons and contrasts between the ships and ways of other days and our own.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Wells Outpours

Joan and Peter: The Story of an Education. By H. G. Wells. New York: The Macmillan Company.

THIS, of course, is not a story, but a further outpouring of the most restless and garrulous intelligence of modern times. To dash off a fresh commentary of a quarter of a million words, put most of it in quotations, clap it between red covers, and call it a novel is a familiar item in his year's work. Never has he been more eloquent, more suggestive, more whimsical and acute, more cocksure and less consistent or conclusive, than on this occasion. Every morning he rises to a fresh world, into which he sallies with unabated zest, immensely curious as to how he may be going to set it right *this* time. Life is one long, vast, youthful adventure, and the only thing that really matters is that we shall not permit it to become ordered, and cut-and-dried, and dully intelligible. Our only hope for the future is to release ourselves from the tyranny of the past. Why pretend that the experience of mankind is a basis for theory or conduct? "If only we could get our eyes and hands free of the old experience," cries Wells-Peter, the educated: "What has mankind done yet to boast about? I despise human history—because I believe in God." As for the chances of the immediate future, "I'm all for the one world state, and the end of flags and kings and custom houses. But I have my doubts of all this talk of making the world safe—safe for democracy. I want the world made safe for the adventure of mankind, which is quite another story."

It is, at all events, Mr. Wells's story, and the only one he ever has to tell. Never need we fear (or hope) to find him outgrowing the phase of irrepressible and insatiable youth which seems to him the *summum bonum*—a youth, in his instance, touched with a Puck-like quality remote from the grossness of many of his contemporaries. Wells-Peter's objection to peace as an end is simply that it would be so dull.

> War tempts imaginative, restless people, and a stagnant peace bores them. And you've got to reckon with intelligence and imagination in this world, Nobby, more than anything. They aren't strong enough to control, perhaps, but they will certainly upset. Inventive, restless men are the particular instruments of the Old Experimenter. He prefers them now to plague, pestilence, famine, flood and earthquake. They are more delicate instruments. And more efficient. And they won't *stand* a passive peace. Under no circumst nces can you hope to induce the chap who contrived the clock fuse and the chap who worked out my gas bag or the chap with a new aeroplane gadget, and me—me, too—to stop celebrating and making our damnedest just in order to sit about safely in meadows joining up daisy chains—like a beastly lot of figures by Walter Crane.

As for the Old Experimenter, he seems to be the Wellsian God of the moment—such a deity as we might have expected Wells to invent by way of relief from the oppressive perfections of his late Invisible King. As our Peter says: "The priest has got his God, and we seek our God forever." Mr. Wells has his moments of prophetic insight, but even at such moments his favorite "take-off" is the immediate past. He is not sufficiently in love with the twentieth century, or even his latest future, to forget his hatred of the Victorian age. Least of all can he forgive the memory of the small woman who, we gather, invented and gave her name to the eighth deadly sin. Vindictively we return, in these pages, to dance once more on her grave—the "alien-spirited old lady, making much of the pathos of her widowhood and trading still on the gallantry and generosity that had welcomed her as a 'girl queen' "; "that poor little old panting German widow," and so on.

Our "story of an education," therefore, begins naturally with a dark picture of the late-Victorian system of the nineties complacently breeding its race of "flanneled fools" to deal with the intricate problems of a vast empire. We look on this spectacle through the eyes of a still youngish Englishman, "Cousin Oswald," who, invalided home from active service of the Empire in India and Africa, finds himself in charge of two young wards for whom he is disposed to do his utmost. Thus conditions are made as favorable as possible for an experiment of what England can do for her young. The guardian is a public-school man who has found himself untrained for his difficult work abroad. He has a high sense of England's destiny and duty to the world—the theory of the White Man's Burden in its least bumptious and most disinterested form. He determines that his wards shall be trained to serve the world through the Empire. How it is to be done he knows not at all. "This story has its comic aspects," says the chronicler; "Oswald went first to the Education Department." But the Imperial Education Department can tell him nothing: "An educational map had still to become a part of the equipment of the civilized state. As it was inconceivable that party capital could be made out of the production of such a map, it was likely to remain a desideratum in Great Britain for many years to come."

"My God!" cries the inquirer, "here are two children, brilliant children—with plenty of money to be spent on them! Doesn't the Empire care a twopenny damn what becomes of them?" The Education Department official doesn't care, at all events, and the inquirer has to grope and experiment as best he can. His influence and certain changes that are in the air help towards a flexible development of the young pair according to the vague and fluid standards of their great original. At the close of our journey with them, as at the beginning, they remain emanations of the Wellsian consciousness, expositors of the Wellsian spirit, rather than human beings interpreted by a creative fancy outside themselves. This Wells-Joan is like her predecessors, Ann Veronica and the rest—not a woman, but a being wrought, but for her body, in her creator's image. For the rest, she is recognizable as the kind of modern female one hears about from male authors, chiefly British. "Cousin Oswald" also is of the Wells connection in his feebler way. The other figures in the book, being aliens to the blood, are more or less frank caricatures. One or two of them, especially the dowager person, Lady Charlotte, seem to catch the infection at times and spout away very much in their author's manner. All the words commonly employed of Mr. Wells may be cordially employed here, in so far as they do not proclaim him a story-teller. Brilliant, suggestive, daring, unconventional, stimulating, eloquent—these pages are all these things. They are also garrulous, ill-ordered, unbalanced, inconclusive, ebullient; with all their plausible air of going to the point, of seeking the fundamental stability, they deal with a world of ideas essentially fluid, impatient, and empirical. In short, they present the momentary impressions, vivid and acute, ardent and shifting, benevolent and irresponsible, of the personality whom, with apologies to his contemporaries, Messrs. Shaw, Bennett, and Chesterton, we can but regard as the authentic *enfant terrible* of our time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

THE following volumes are announced for early publication by E. P. Dutton & Company: "The Garden of Survival," by Algernon Blackwood; "The Crescent Moon," by Brett Young; "En Route," by J. K. Huysmans; "Getting Together with Latin America," by Hyatt Verrill; "Boy's Book of Chemistry," by Charles Ramsey Clarke; "Mother's Nursery Tales," by Katherine Pyle; "Fairy Tales of Weir," by Anna McClure Sholl; "Bugs and Wings," by Annie W. Franchot; "Life After Death," by James H. Hyslop.

"Grit-a-Plenty," by Dillon Wallace, will be published shortly by the Revell Press.

Early in October Charles Scribner's Sons will publish "Fighting the Boche Underground," by Captain H. D. Trounce.

Small, Maynard & Company are bringing out about October 15 "The Peak of the Load," by Mildred Aldrich.

"The Profits of Religion," by Upton Sinclair, will soon be published by the author at Pasadena.

Immediate publications of John Lane Company include: "Rupert Brooke: a Memoir," by Edward Marsh; "Gone Astray"; "The Ghost Girl," by H. de Vere Stacpoole; "The Pathetic Snobs," by Dolf Wyllarde; "Memory-Poems of War and Love," by A. Newberry Choyce.

The Princeton University Press will publish shortly "Wasp Studies Afield," by Phil and Nellie Rau; "Professional Re-education of Maimed Soldiers," by Leon de Paeuw; "Early Egyptian Records of Travel," Vol. III, by David Paton; "The A B C of the Federal Reserve," by Edwin Walter Kemmerer; "A Simplified Italian Manual," by A. L. Frothingham; "Early Christian Iconography and a School of Ivory Carvers in Provence," by E. Baldwin Smith; "A Guide to Princeton," by V. L. Collins.

HOW can one immortalize the products of one's pen which lie buried in the back numbers of periodicals? This is the problem which last year confronted Prof. Joseph Jastrow. Eight essays of his, on subjects as remote from one another as Paladino, Education, Animal Psychology, the Supernatural, had appeared in various magazines, and were in danger of being forgotten. They could be rescued from oblivion, he felt, only by being made into a book. But a book of "essays" would not do (no one reads "essays" any more); they must somehow be fused into a unitary work. The ordinary reader, inexpert in psychology, might wonder where the unity was to be found in so heterogeneous a group of subjects; but Professor Jastrow's psychological insight perceived that they were all about things that somebody or other believed, and that by a liberal use of the cement of psychological generalizations they might all be welded into one whole. Hence the new volume and its title, "The Psychology of Conviction" (Houghton Mifflin; $2.50). As the reader will imagine, the book would have been much more interesting had the cement been left out. Two rather wearying introductory essays enforce the truths that convention and emotion have much to do with belief, and that conviction is often based on preconceived conclusions; and in the remaining essays the author repeatedly feels bound, as a professional psychologist, to give a new elaboration of these somewhat obvious psychological discoveries. In his actual portrayal of the various beliefs upon which he wrote most of his magazine articles he is much more interesting, for here he usually has something very definite to say. Particularly is this the case in the essays on "The Feminine Mind" and "Militarism and Pacifism"—both of which, by the way, are published for the first time. The paper on Paladino also is of decided interest, although the author's antipathy to all "psychical research" illustrates, in a way he does not suspect, his thesis of the influence of preconceived ideas upon judgment. There is also, possibly, a touch of this same tendency to prejudge the facts in the spicy paper called "Malicious Animal Magnetism," but if really present here it will be easily forgiven. Another paper which deserves many readers deals with "The Democratic Suspicion of Education." On the whole, there can be no doubt that Professor Jastrow did well in saving most of his papers from the oblivion of the bound magazine. Only it is a pity that, like so many other good books, this one has been so nearly spoiled by too much "psychology."

THE history of San Domingo is a continuous series of revolutions, murders, treasons, and intensive selfishness. After a few pages it loses the aspect of tragedy and becomes opera-bouffe, with four Presidents in one year and with the same man being driven out of the country in one revolution and reëlected Emperor or President a few months later. Constitutions are like jugglers' balls, and each President has three or four from which to choose as suits his temperament or pocketbook. An authoritative work by Otto Schoenrich, the secretary of the United States Commission sent to investigate the financial condition of this unhappy country, is "Santo Domingo: A Country with a Future" (Macmillan, $3). The first six chapters comprise an historical sketch of which the two dominant features are the intensely interesting account of the adventures of Columbus, and the author's firm conviction that the present native *mélange* of Spanish, Indian, and Negro will never be able to sustain a reputable government unaided. Succeeding chapters deal with the geography, fauna, people, religion, commerce, and debt. The division of the work into the unnecessary number of twenty-three chapters and three appendices results in much repetition. The first dozen chapters, if carefully written, would have been a quite sufficient exposition of this demi-island. As is natural in a work by one occupying official position, a favorable view is taken of the American occupation of the island. "Eventually," says Mr. Schoenrich, "in all likelihood after the European war, the Government is to be turned back to the Dominican people, and it is probable that such devolution will be under conditions that will assure a stable Government, peace, and progress."

MARY BROWNE was a prim, well-behaved little English girl who, in 1821, at the age of fourteen, went to France with her family and kept a diary during the months she stayed there. Her record, entitled "The Diary of a Girl in France in 1821" (Dutton; $3 net), is amusing, not so much for what she wrote as for her attitude, which was so entirely that which a prim, well-behaved little English girl's should have been at the time. She listened with the respectful attention expected of her to the facts poured into her little ears, and she put them down in her diary with the diligence of the modern student of Baedeker. She made her own the English prejudices against France cultivated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by her elders a hundred years ago, and she confided them to her pages with parrot-like fidelity. It is really funny to see how determined she was to disapprove of everything French. She had no sooner landed than she found the weather all wrong, the country about Calais the ugliest she had ever seen, the villages miserable, the people dirty and fat, the inns shocking, the servants untidy. Even Amiens Cathedral, though it was "a pretty thing," was not near so grand as York Minster. Things did not improve in Paris, where it was very disagreeable to walk in the streets, and the pictures at the Louvre disappointed her, and the servants couldn't get enough to eat, and the shops were shabby. It was unspeakably worse at Versailles, where the family settled down and had leisure to pick out all that was shocking in the French. And so the diary goes on until she begins to count the days before her return to England, and we come to the journey back when her two small brothers, asked how they liked France, each answered in turn, "Je déteste la France!" The diary may offer a curious study in child-training at the beginning of the last century. But it is not easy to understand why a new edition should be brought out now when the English are doing their best to forget that at any time they could have believed one Englishman to be worth seven Frenchmen. Nor are the child-like drawings made by Mary Browne sufficient reason for the publication, except as an object-lesson to that sort of post-impressionist who hopes to achieve greatness by forgetting the traditions of centuries and becoming again like unto a little child in his art.

THROUGHOUT his absorbing narrative, "The Wonderful Story of Joan of Arc" (Cupples & Leon; $1.50), Mr. C. M. Stevens strives successfully to show how her faith, courage, and love of country have a significant meaning for all of us to-day. "Truly she was," as Bourguignon wrote, "the most beautiful flower of Christianity." Both her church and her country have paid due tributes to her memory, for on April 11, 1909, Pope Pius X published a decree placing her name in the calendar of saints. And on her statue erected near the fortress of Crotoy, where she was imprisoned, is an inscription with these words: "Let us remember always, Frenchmen, that our country was born again from the heart of a woman, from her tenderness and her tears, from the blood she shed for us."

THE distinguished and happy minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, Henry Sloane Coffin, publishes in his latest book, "In a Day of Social Rebuilding" (Yale University Press; $1.00 net), the lectures which he recently delivered before the School of Religion at Yale, on the Lyman Beecher Foundation. To say that Dr. Coffin has maintained the extraordinarily high standard of this notable lectureship, and produced a volume worthy to be placed beside Phillips Brooks's "Lectures on Preaching" and R. W. Dale's "Nine Lectures on Preaching," is high praise, but it is deserved. Written primarily for the counsel and instruction of theological students, the lectures have a wealth of advice on the practical problems of worship, organization, teaching and preaching, pastoral care, and evangelism, drawn from the rich experience of a peculiarly successful ministry in a great city. Such parochial topics, however, are wisely subordinated to the vaster problem of the church's relationship to "the regeneration of the entire social order." In this sense Mr. Coffin's lectures make a bigger book than most that have preceded it in this long series of Lyman Beecher volumes. It is distinctly a contribution to the higher spiritual statesmanship of our time, and therefore a book for the layman quite as much as for the clergyman. Mr. Coffin sees the Great War as "an exposing judgment of God" on an age which had ignorantly or wickedly "made self-interest the paramount law of life." In that age individual and social relationships in politics, in industry, in the international field, in the church itself, were fundamentally wrong. Now are men set to the task of rebuilding society on new lines and to holier ends. To leadership in this task he calls the ministers and members of the churches that claim to serve the will of Christ. "Its citizens have a supreme allegiance to Jesus Christ, and their citizenship in any commonwealth on earth must be fulfilled under superior loyalty to His heavenly community." The book is vigorously written; we cannot refrain from mentioning the exceeding charm and freshness of the author's quotations from literary and theological sources.

IN this period of crisis in the world's history, when human interest in the occult has been so much quickened by the great war, and when, as some would have us believe, spiritualism is doing for Christianity what Christianity once did for Hellenic philosophy, a reissue of the pioneer work of Edmund Gurney, F. W. H. Myers, and Frank Podmore, "Phantasms of the Living" (Dutton; $7 net), is at least timely. The cases contained in the original work have here been reduced from seven hundred to a hundred and eighty-six, enabling Mrs. Henry Sidgwick, the editor, to diminish the bulk of the work by about one-half without impairing its value, those retained being selected as best illustrating the authors' remarks or else as best evidenced of their class. The present book is, in view of more recent experiments and investigations, very limited in scope, being confined to instances of apparent telepathy between living beings. In the thirty-one years since it was originally published, says the editor,

> much new and illuminating evidence . . . has been accumulated; our knowledge about transient hallucinations of the sane, veridical and other, has been considerably added to, . . . motor automatism . . . has been much studied, and finally evidence pointing to the operation of telepathy, not only between minds in the body, but between the living and the dead, has so much increased that, had he written now, I think it probable that Gurney (as well as Myers) would have referred to this possibility less tentatively than he does here.

Indeed, during this interval an immense mass of literature on the subject has appeared, much of it from the pens of men trained in scientific investigation. The increased interest of the scientific world in such inquiry is, perhaps, illustrated by nothing so well as by the recent establishment of a department of psychical research in the Leland Stanford School of Psychology.

A SLIM red book of modest proportions is "The Canadian Who's Who" (London: The Times; $1 net). This is a first creditable attempt to bring together the names and biographies of prominent Canadians—those who are living in their own land and those who have scattered to the four winds. It is welcome as a convenient means of furthering our personal acquaintance with our Canadian neighbors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Art

An Exhibition with a Promise

FROM little things big may come. The New York International Exposition of Science, Arts, and Industries at The Bronx is not yet quite so large as its name suggests. This is not a time when it is easy to begin anything international. But when peace comes and the conditions of labor are more normal, the Exposition itself may develop into something as important as the old Earl's Court and, later, the Shepherd's Bush Exhibitions in London, on which this is evidently modelled.

It is true that these London exhibitions paid their way by the amusements they provided for the public, but they had their serious side. The Bronx Exposition evidently aims at the same combination of amusement and instruction. It has arranged a little art exhibition well worth the journey to 177th Street. The international element had, of course, to be left out this year from the art as from other sections. Many of the paintings and sculptures may have been shown before, but I doubt if they have ever been seen to better advantage. The small galleries are well planned, the plain wooden walls painted gray make a quiet neutral background, the little trees here and there break up the space agreeably with their tall upright lines.

The selection of the paintings reveals an admirably liberal spirit in the jury, who have included the canvases of unknown as well as the best-known artists. Among the known artists, Miss Cecilia Beaux supplies the chief surprise; this is the first time I have had the pleasure of seeing her as a decorative painter. I am far from hoping, however, that she will often put aside her portrait painting for decoration. The large Diana-like figure in green draperies seated against a formal landscape is not decorative either in feeling or in treatment except for a certain stiffness in the folds of the draperies and in the pose, while the subject affords Miss Beaux no chance for the expression of character and the realistic rendering of dress which are so amusing and so effective in her finest portraits. This cool, placid lady, or goddess, is characterless compared to the conventionally arrayed modern girl that was one of the best things in last winter's Academy. Childe Hassam also seems out of his element in painting his Nymph in the Woods. He should have painted her in the brilliant, glittering sunlight which holds such endless variety for him. He has studied the trees carefully and felt the beauty of the blue-green distance seen between them; he has been conscious of quality in the cool shade, but no less conscious of monotony in the woodland. The tiny nude figure does not belong to her surroundings, wanders there for no other purpose than to relieve the monotony, and therefore, instead of relieving it, only strikes a discordant note. Something of this same feeling of the effect being forced is given by Frieseke's Morning Sun, No. 11, so obvious is the arrangement of color, the deliberate repetition of green—in the blinds, the light drifting through the windows, the candlestick, and the trimming on the woman's dress—and of purple in the dressing-table, the mirror's reflection of the mantelpiece, the parasol against the wall. You cannot see the harmony for the means by which it has been obtained. This is true, too, in a measure, of Richard Miller's Far-Away Thoughts; for charming as it is, you cannot help wondering if the woman lounging on her low chair, idly holding her guitar, has not tried to lose herself in day dreams, simply that the painter might have an excuse to picture again the play of sunlight which he paints so well and of which he never tires. No painter ever gets his effect without effort, but the master conceals the effort, and is too subtle to let his finished canvas show how the effect was obtained. Two little exercises in cubism by William and Marguerite Zorach, of no particular importance in themselves, are useful as reminders of the extremes to which indifference to the painter's subtleties—the painter's poetry—may lead. The chief object of cubists and most post-impressionists is to escape the convention of the schools, but in the endeavor they have fallen victims, overnight as it were, to a convention more deadening to individuality than any evolved in the course of centuries. They are eager to express themselves, and manage to express nothing save a formula the most rigid yet invented.

To turn from paintings like these is to find Arthur B. Davies entirely classical in his sombre, golden-brown High Sierras; Ernest Lawson romanticism itself in his curiously Mark Fisher-like Summer—Westchester County, and Gardner Symons impressionistic in his Millstream in Winter, with its telling touches of red in the houses on the far side of the stream and of blue in the shadows falling on the snow-laden foreground. Colin Campbell Cooper's Cathedral at Malines recalls the world's loss during the four years' horrors that began at Liège—the one picture in the whole collection that has anything to do with the war, though it must have been painted before the war began. In his Cornish Coast, Paul Dougherty suggests very successfully the rich coloring and heavy atmosphere of England, and Jonas Lie, in his Driftwood, is as truthful in giving his impression of an angry sea. Few of the figure subjects are of interest. The girl in Charles W. Hawthorne's Fille du Pêcheur seems but one of the details in a study of still-life, as inanimate as the plate she holds and the fish and the slices of lemon and the green jar. Leopold Seyfert's Woman of Segovia, for all the elaborate painting of the old, wrinkled face, is lifeless compared to Zuloaga's tragic peasant women, with faces dim and shrouded, and the memory of Zuloaga's exhibition is still fresh. Robert Henri was apparently too engrossed with the pattern of the dress to pay much heed to the child who wears it in his Patience Serious. A more original adventure is Harriet Lord's In the Grand Central, a spacious interior, airy, full of gray light, the floor dotted with tiny black figures—a little record of something seen and felt.

The sculpture is no less agreeably arranged. The shadow of Rodin falls rather aggressively over some of the exhibits. One questions whether, but for Rodin, Attilio Piccirelli would have seen A Man just as he has done, or Nanna Matthews Bryant would have found her composition for The Kiss, or Jo Davidson would have used sculpture as the medium for so much emotion, so much passion. Most of the examples, however, are in a gayer, lighter vein. It may be because the plan was to exhibit part of the sculpture in a formal garden that there are so many fauns and Pans and dancers. These, no doubt, will tell better among the flowers and foliage for which they were designed. As it is, the most satisfactory and the gayest is Malvina Hoffman's Faun and Panther Cub, chosen for the fountain placed in the centre of the galleries, and so shown under the most appropriate conditions. Here and there a bust suggests charac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter, more especially J. Jusko's of S. C. Judge Ch. L. Guy and Toma Lewis's of A. J. Conant, a trifle affected, perhaps, but a sympathetic study of the old, bearded face.

The crafts are not forgotten, even if as yet textiles and pottery do little more than explain what the scope of the art section of the Exposition may eventually be. It is high time that New York, home of the American National Academy, should have an annual exhibition of importance. It may be that the opportunity neglected by the Academy will be seized by the management of the Bronx Exposition, and the chief interest of their first year's art collection is the promise it holds out of exhibitions, representative of the art of this and other countries, in the days to come when the world will be at peace again. N. N.

Drama

The Theatre To-day and To-morrow

ANOTHER theatrical season has begun and is very nearly in full blast. Several dozens of plays, new or old, are performed every evening, and most of them to full houses. On the whole, notwithstanding an occasional speedy withdrawal, the era might seem, on the surface, to be one of very general dramatic prosperity. There is, indeed, no apparent reason for doubting that the bigger managers are making a good deal of money, in spite of war taxes and other existing conditions. But from any point of view whence the theatre may be regarded as an artistic institution—with all its infinite potentialities for good and harm—the outlook has seldom been more unsatisfactory and depressing. Of the old, silly, sensational, or crassly sentimental shows, which most readily provoke the guffaws or plaudits of the indiscriminating masses there is, it may be readily admitted, a superabundance. Managerial profiteers are wise in their generation and according to their limited light. For the intelligent playgoer, seeking diversion of which he need not be ashamed, or some genuine emotional or intellectual stimulus, nothing, or very little, is provided.

Of the thirty or forty pieces so far produced in New York —some, of course, much better of their kind and in method than others—few have any permanent value or require specification here. The best of them do not rise much above the level of respectable mediocrity. The war-plays have the interest of timeliness and the merit of fervent patriotism, but, almost without exception, are moulded on the lines of conventional melodrama. Wilde's "An Ideal Husband" was worth reviving, if only for the sake of its literary sparkle and as an example of artificial comedy. There is some distinctive literary quality, also, together with considerable ingenuity and freshness in "Tea for Three," but this trifle is wholly foreign in spirit and atmosphere and tiresome in its juvenile and shallow cynicism. "Humpty Dumpty" is a pleasant little comedy, with many good points, but is vague in intent and unconvincing in its outcome, the author failing to redeem the promise of a good first act. Such plays of youth as "Penrod" and "Jonathan Makes a Wish" command attention as efforts in a comparatively new field. The latter, although unsuccessful here, is a notable little work which deserved a better fate. It is to be hoped that Mr. Stuart Walker, one of the most enterprising and original of our managers, will not be discouraged by this temporary failure, which was due partly to his lack of experience in dramatic construction and partly to inadequate performance.

Across the Atlantic, in England, the condition of the stage is not much more encouraging. There, too, the theatres are doing remarkably good business, but the fare offered is, for the most part, very light, trivial, or commonplace. The prevalence of the war-play, and of so-called musical comedy, is largely accounted for by the fact that London and other large cities are full of soldiers lately returned from or going to the front. They undoubtedly create a demand for stirring war melodrama or careless frolic. The relation between cause and effect is here plainly discernible. But it must be remembered that the general degeneracy and poverty of theatrical art were topics of constant lament long before the war began. The actual situation is not, could not indeed be, much worse now than it was five years ago. The change has been in character rather than in quality. There would not be much cause for complaint if the plays manifestly suited to the moment were good of their kind. It would be unreasonable to look now for new masterpieces of wit, satire, or emotion. The dispiriting fact is that in the most recent output there is the old rigid adherence to ancient artifices, tricks, and conventions, the same lack of originality or invention, the old substitution of sheer theatricalism for genuine imagination or the realities of life. Of all this the cause lies much deeper than the temporary disturbances and convulsions of war. It is to be sought in the progressive subjection of the whole English-speaking stage —the process is not yet complete, but threatens to be—to the blighting control of money-grubbing commercial syndicates. The fatal circuit system of dependent theatres, prescribed plays, long runs, limited companies, and ordained stars, originated here in the far past, has been extended to England, and is slowly, but surely, fastening its grip there. Before very long—unless a sudden financial collapse should prevent the consummation—there is likely to be an Anglo-American stage virtually under one commercial governance. J. R. T.

ONE of the latest plays to attain the somewhat doubtful honor of print is the "General Post" of J. E. Harold Terry (E. P. Dutton & Co.). The great popularity achieved by it on both sides of the Atlantic will doubtless attract many readers, but the chief virtues of it are essentially theatrical and far more effective in the theatre than in the study. Beyond question it shines brightly in comparison with the majority of current war pieces. Wholly independent of the cheap thrills of melodrama, it is a genuine comedy, dealing with general conditions—instead of specific instances—animated by a fine, liberal, and intensely patriotic spirit, and full of shrewd and humorous insight. Moreover, it is written with liveliness if not with any remarkable brilliancy. On the other hand, the plot, whose progress and issue are obvious from the first, and the personages are all modelled upon old and conventional types. Characters and incidents are so plainly devised to secure a predestined end that there is no opportunity for doubt or suspense.

Amusements

"Everything" "Is the biggest thing ever."—*Journal*, and at the lowest prices. AT THE
Mat. To-day Best Seats $1 Evenings at 8:15 HIPPODROME

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

POETRY AND DRAMA

Little Theatre Classics. Volume I. Little, Brown. $1.50 net.
Norwood, R. W. The Modernists. Doran. $1.25 net.

FICTION

Baroness Orczy. The Man in Grey. Doran. $1.40 net.
Birmingham, G. A. The Island Mystery. Doran. $1.50 net.
Buckrose, J. E. The Silent Legion. Doran. $1.45 net.
Burt, M. S. John O' May. Scribner. $1.35 net.
Canfield, Dorothy. Home Fires in France. Holt. $1.35 net.
Cather, W. S. My Antonia. Houghton Mifflin. $1.60 net.
Dodge, Louis. A Runaway Woman. Scribner. $1.50 net.
Goodwin, Ernest. The Caravan Man. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50 net.
Gould, Nat. As Fast as the Wind. Stokes. $1.25 net.
Gray, Joslyn. Elsie Marley, Honey. Scribner. $1.35 net.
Hurrell, F. G. A Dreamer Under Arms. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Masson, T. L. Best Short Stories. Doubleday, Page. $1 net.
McSpadden, J. W. Famous Ghost Stories. Crowell. $1.25 net.
Norris, K. Josselyn's Wife. Doubleday, Page. $1.40 net.
Sears, C. E. The Bell-Ringer. Houghton Mifflin. $1.35 net.
Terhune, A. P. Fortune. Doubleday, Page. $1.40 net.
Tokutomi, K. The Heart of Nami-San. Stratford. $1.50.
Vallotton, Benjamin. Potterat and the War. Dodd, Mead.
Vachell, H. A. The Soul of Susan Yellam. Doran. $1.50 net.
Wells, C. The Room with the Tassels. Doran. $1.40 net.
Wells, H. G. Joan and Peter. Macmillan. $1.75 net.
Wild Apples. By the author of "The Straight Road." Doran. $1.50 net.
Williams, V. The Man with the Club Foot. McBride. $1.50 net.

TRAVEL AND DESCRIPTION

Wright, H. S. The Seventh Continent. Badger. $2.50 net.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Gay, H. N. Abramo Lincoln. R. Bemporad & Figlio.
Gordon, A. C. Jefferson Davis. Scribner. $1.50 net.
Lavell, C. F., and Payne, C. E. Imperial England. Macmillan.
Leupp, F. E. George Westinghouse, His Life and Achievements. Little, Brown. $3 net.
McGlothlin, W. J. The Course of Christian History. Macmillan. $2.
Meigs, W. M. Life of John Caldwell Calhoun. 2 vols. Neale Publishing Co. $10 net.
Page, T. N. Tomasso Jefferson. R. Bemporad & Figlio.
Sothern, E. H. The Melancholy Tale of "Me." Popular edition. Scribner. $2 net.

NATURAL SCIENCE

Emerson, L. E. Nervousness. Little, Brown. $1.25 net.
Evolution of the Earth and Its Inhabitants. Yale Law Press. $2.50 net.

SOCIAL SCIENCE

Herzog, S. The Future of German Industrial Exports. Doubleday, Page. $1 net.
West, H. L. Federal Power, Its Growth and Necessity. Doran. $1.50.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Appel, J. H. Living the Creative Life. McBride. $1.50 net.
Faulkner, J. A. Wesley as Sociologist, Theologian, Churchman. Methodist Book Concern.

THE WAR

A General's Letter to His Son on Minor Tactics. Doran. $1 net.
Anderson, R. G. Not Taps but Reveille. Putnam.
Anonymous. The Near East from Within. Dutton. $5.
Artemas, the Second Book. Doran. 50 cents net.
Call, A. P. Nerves and the War. Little, Brown. $1.25 net.
Le Goffic, C. General Foch at the Marne. Translated by Lucy Menzies. Dutton. $1.75.
Masefield, J. The War and the Future. Macmillan. $1.25.
Rouvier, Jacques. Present Day Warfare. Scribner. $1.35 net.
The Son Liveth: Messages from a Soldier to His Mother. Little, Brown. 75 cents net.
Woods, H. C. The Cradle of the War. Little, Brown. $2.50 net.

JUVENILE

Eastman, C. A. Indian Heroes and Great Chieftains. Little, Brown. $1.25 net.
Hornibrook, I. Scout Drake in War Time. Little, Brown. $1.35 net.
Hunt, C. W. The Little House in the Woods. Houghton, Mifflin. $1.35 net.

MISCELLANEOUS

Crane, F. Twenty-one. Doubleday, Page. 50 cents.
Guest, F. B. Casting Out Fear. Lane. 75 cents net.
Hayden, George and Alice. Throw Physic to the Dogs. Doran. $1 net.
Nettleton, B. E. One Hundred Portion War Time Recipes. Lippincott. $1.00 net.

This Book Is True

The author writes:

"Everything that happens to anybody in this book has happened to somebody in France of whom I have had personal knowledge."

HOME FIRES IN FRANCE

By DOROTHY CANFIELD

Author of "The Bent Twig."

$1.35 net

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44 St. New York

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law

Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.

AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT. No. 189.

By CLARENCE H. NORTHCOTT, Ph.D., Sometime University Tutor in Sociology to classes of the Workers' Educational Association, Sydney, N. S. W., Australia. Paper Covers, $2.50; Cloth, $3.00.

USE OF FACTORY STATISTICS IN THE INVESTIGATION OF INDUSTRIAL FATIGUE. No. 190.

By PHILIP SARGANT FLORENCE, M.A. (Cambridge), Ph.D. (Columbia), Garth Fellow, Scientific Assistant, United States Public Health Service. Paper Covers, $1.25.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVE. AND 30TH ST., NEW YORK

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CAL. 280 MADISON AVE., N. Y.

Voltaire on the English Stage

(Univ. Calif. Publ. Mod. Philology)

By HAROLD LAWTON BRUCE

An attractive, intelligent analysis of the motives and influences underlying adaptations of Voltaire's dramas for the English stage.

Price, postpaid (paper), $1.50

AN APPROACH TO RECONSTRUCTION

The Restoration *of* Trade Union Conditions

By SIDNEY WEBB

Fifty cents B. W. HUEBSCH *New York*

SEND FOR OUR NEW
Illustrated Catalogue of Publications.
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
120 College St., NEW HAVEN
280 Madison Avenue, NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Sections Section II

International Relations Section

Vol. CVII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1918 No. 2779

The International Situation

By JOHN BASSETT MOORE

NOT long after the Young Turk Revolution, some of the incidents of which I had personally witnessed, a friend asked me if I could explain why the expectations formed of the movement and of its regenerative effects had been so largely disappointed. I at once replied that the explanation lay in the simple fact that the population of Turkey was the same the day after the revolution as it was the day before.

In spite of the evident continuity of the fundamental conditions of human existence, it seems to be very easy in moments of emotional exaltation to indulge the superficial assumption that those conditions have suddenly and radically changed, and that we are dealing with a world altogether new. This tendency is greatly facilitated by the general lack of knowledge of what has gone before, a lack often strikingly displayed even by professed historians, who, while minutely detailing names, dates, and events, may remain unconscious of the workings of human psychology, and, preoccupied with changing forms and phrases, may fail to perceive the persistent resemblance of the essential causes of the struggles through which men and nations have passed.

Among the assumptions of novelty now so generally prevalent is the oft-repeated supposition that the present world conflict is both different from and far greater than any that ever before occurred. In the sense that more men are actually under arms, that larger sums of money are spent, and that the destructive devices employed are more varied, this supposition is correct. But all such things are to be viewed relatively. According to the Mosaic account of the creation, if at that early stage only one person, Eve, had died childless, the results to the human race would have been disastrous. As the result of increased populations and measures of conscription, larger numbers of men are now under arms than in previous wars, but, if the effects be considered, we must admit that none of the parties to the present conflict has as yet suffered the relative loss that the German states did during the Thirty Years' War or that France did before the close of the Napoleonic wars. We are told that the wars growing out of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, which together lasted almost a quarter of a century, materially reduced the average stature of the French, while, in the course of the Thirty Years' War, three-fifths of the population of Germany perished, and devastation was carried to a point never since approached.

Another prevalent supposition is found in the daily reiterated statement that a far larger part of the world is involved in the present war than in any previous international conflict. This statement is made in spite of the fact that all Europe was involved in the Napoleonic wars; that Spain was then a battle-ground; that the national existence of the Netherlands was for a time even suppressed; that Scandinavia and Switzerland were swept into the vortex; that Africa did not escape; that, after the United States declared war against Great Britain in 1812, all the American continents were implicated; and that the struggle was also carried on in the Far East.

In reality, just as the resettlement of the surface of the earth from time to time produces earthquakes, so the readjustment of human affairs has from time to time produced armed conflicts. At the present moment the world is passing through a period of political readjustment such as previous centuries have often witnessed. Nations rise and fall. A particular Power reaches a position where its strength and aggressive tendencies excite the apprehensions of other Powers. Coalitions are formed. Competition becomes keener. Rivalries become sharper and are pushed more relentlessly and with less and less regard for consequences. Feelings are stirred; animosities become more intense, and eventually something happens that precipitates a break. War ensues, and in the conflict that follows even the party that precipitated the collision professes to regard itself as acting upon the defensive.

Another very prevalent fallacy may be found in the assumption that the conditions of international life have been radically changed by improved means of transportation and communication; but here again, as in all matters, the principle of relativity must be applied. Steamships, telegraphs, and telephones are not the monopoly of any nation, and previous centuries have had world-wide wars without any of those devices. While it took longer to reach a certain point, the belligerents were in this regard on the same footing; and the fact that it took a month or six weeks instead of ten days to go from one point to another did not deter the belligerents from making the transit. It has been said that during the Seven Years' War men fought in Saxony for empire in America; but Europeans then fought each other in America and also in the Far East for empire in those quarters. The British fought Spaniards in Havana and in Manila and fought Frenchmen in the West Indies and in Bengal. A handful of troops settled the fate of India. The area of the great struggle that began thirty years later embraced the entire globe. A dominant motive on the part of Napoleon in ceding Louisiana to the United States was to prevent the British from seizing it. After the lapse of a decade Americans fought Englishmen in New Orleans, and when the Treaty of Ghent was signed British troops held various places within the boundaries of the United States. The termination of the Napoleonic wars involved territorial and political changes in all parts of the world.

The conditions of essential importance as affecting the present international situation are, as heretofore, political rather than physical. In other words, the important question is not whether it takes seven days or seven weeks to make

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a voyage between the United States and Europe, but the question whether the voyage is made for a political or a non-political purpose. The United States is often spoken of as having heretofore occupied a position of "isolation," in the sense of lacking power and influence. The term is misleading. To speak of a great trading and immigrant-receiving country; a country which has opened distant empires to commerce; a country which has for a hundred years claimed to hold in its watch and ward the political destinies of the Western Hemisphere, as an "isolated" Power, is a manifest absurdity. When Lord Salisbury twenty years ago spoke of Great Britain's "splendid isolation," he was not understood to mean that Great Britain had ceased to be a great Power, but merely to assert that her freedom at the time from political alliances had, in his opinion, the effect of strengthening rather than of weakening her international position and influence.

The conception of isolation, so far as it concerns the United States, is justified only in so far as it denotes the fact that the United States has heretofore, as a matter of national policy, for the most part avoided political arrangements or alliances with other countries. Up to a recent day this was regarded as a permanent feature of national policy; but we may admit that it was a policy that rested upon the conceptions of statesmen rather than upon popular impulse or reflection. With its establishment the names of Washington and Jefferson are preëminently identified; but there were, no doubt, many occasions when it would have ceased to guide the destinies of the United States if popular impulse had been consulted. We little appreciate to-day the situation of the United States in the years immediately succeeding the establishment of independence, and especially after the outbreak of the wars growing out of the French Revolution. While the conservative elements, whom war had not wholly alienated from the mother country, were opposed to our becoming implicated in that struggle, there can be no doubt that the popular sympathy with France was widespread and demonstrative; and the hazards of the situation were immensely increased by the political alliance with France which still existed. Less than fifteen years after the close of the Napoleonic wars, a gentleman in the western part of the State of New York, referring to the popular agitation then in progress in the United States in favor of the Greeks in their struggle for independence, declared that he could, from his sparsely settled region, furnish "five hundred men six feet high with sinewy arms and case-hardened constitutions, bold spirits and daring adventurers who would travel upon a bushel of corn and a gallon of whisky per man from the extreme part of the world to Constantinople," to aid the Greeks in their struggle. The demonstrations of sympathy in the case of Hungary and Kossuth twenty years later were far more general and pronounced. Conservative men were naturally alarmed, and perhaps were not unjustified in thinking that a policy of intervention, if espoused by those higher in authority, would receive a tumultuous popular support.

In view of these antecedents it is not without reason that eminent Senators have already been led to discuss the question whether considerations of foreign policy and of political alliances will not hereafter play a large part in our electoral campaigns. There is no doubt that this would be the case if the popular interest in questions were always proportioned to their importance. But there are few countries in which the public uniformly exercises an appreciable judgment upon or control over foreign affairs. The popular mind is more likely to be preoccupied with questions obviously affecting the fundamental conditions of daily life, such as food and raiment, taxation and transportation, tariff and finance. That questions of political alliance would continuously excite and hold popular interest because of general principles involved or conjectural future effects is a supposition which experience does not justify. On the other hand, because foreign complications so readily arouse national feelings and suggest the thought of war, there is always the possibility that an international question may overshadow all other issues in a political campaign.

Proposals and demands are now constantly heard for a league of nations to prevent the recurrence of wars. The circumstance that such thoughts are among the invariable concomitants of a great conflict by no means justifies their rejection; but the fact that, after centuries of aspiration and of effort, they still remain substantially unrealized, may suggest the necessity of subjecting particular plans to intelligent examination. In the United States the idea of a league of nations has been most actively urged by the "League to Enforce Peace." But, while this organization has adopted a definite programme, its adherents apparently are not in accord on at least one vital point, since some of them have indicated that their object would be attained by a league embracing the Allies and their associates in the present conflict. It requires little reflection to show how defective this conception is. Such a combination could be called a league to enforce peace only in the sense in which the numerous previous alliances during the past thousand years, styled "Grand," "Holy," or otherwise, and professing as their object peace, justice, and security for the rights of all nations, might have been so denominated. Certain nations, having confidence in the purity and benevolence of their own purposes, have repeatedly associated themselves for the purpose of preventing other nations, whose aims and motives they distrusted, from carrying out the evil designs imputed to them. Surely there is nothing inherently wrong in such a combination; but the elevated title assumed by the members of the group is regarded by the nations outside of and opposed to it as an entire misnomer. In reality such a league represents nothing more than the venerable and somewhat instinctive idea of balance of power, and cannot be regarded as introducing a new world-order, such as is contemplated in President Wilson's proposal for a league of nations.

The platform of the "League to Enforce Peace" does not commit it to the group plan; nor yet does the platform necessarily exclude such a measure—a circumstance much emphasized by the eminent Chilian publicist, Dr. Alejandro Alvarez, in a searching examination of the League's programme. Dr. Alvarez is now Secretary-General to the American Institute of International Law, a Pan-American organization formed under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment; and his examination appears as an appendix to the report, which is published only in French, of the proceedings of the Institute at its second meeting at Havana. His conclusions, which are adverse to the League's plan, will no doubt have great weight, especially in Latin America.

In the countries of Europe the idea of a league to "enforce" peace has not made striking headway. It is true that eminent statesmen have spoken of it in approving terms,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but it would be a mistake to ascribe too much weight to such utterances, unless interpreted in the sense of a political alliance intended to assure a preponderance of power. In England, the proposal has been discussed both favorably and unfavorably, but with an adverse or skeptical tendency on the part of those who adopt the historical method. An attitude extensively prevailing out of doors may be reflected in a debate in the House of Commons on July 17, 1918, as reported in the London *Times* of the following day (page 10, column 2). The discussion ran as follows:

Mr. Bonar Law, Chancellor of the Exchequer (Bootle, U.), replying to Sir W. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.L.), said that it would not be possible to give a day for the House to discuss a motion approving the principle of a League of Nations before the adjournment.

Sir W. Dickinson asked whether, the Government having stated that they associated themselves whole-heartedly with President Wilson's plan to create a League of Nations, it would not be desirable to obtain the support of the House of Commons to that policy. Mr. Bonar Law.—Yes, Sir, but it is a question of giving a day before the adjournment, and I do not see how that is possible. Sir E. Carson (Dublin University, U.).—Is there anybody who opposes the League of Nations? Mr. Bonar Law. —I have met no one who opposes it. Lieutenant-Colonel Lord H. Cavendish-Bentinck.—Does any one in this country really know what the Government means by a League of Nations? Mr. Bonar Law.—I hope every one in this country knows as clearly what the Government means as what any one else means. [Laughter.] Mr. A. Williams (Durham, N.W., L.). Is the rt. hon. gentleman aware that there is a strong feeling in the country that the Government have not made their position clear on this matter? Mr. Bonar Law.—I do not think there is any justification for that ffeeling. Mr. H. Samuel (Cleveland, L.) asked if the rt. hon. gentleman's answer implied that neither the Government nor any one else really understood what a League of Nations was, and, if that was so, was it not desirable that steps should be taken at once to explore the whole subject and come to a definite opinion. Mr. Bonar Law said his answer did not imply anything of the kind. He added if there was a general desire for a discussion he would try to give a day, but he did not think it was necessary before the recess. Mr. Pringle suggested that there were already two sects in this new faith, and that it was important to prevent further heresies. Mr. Bonar Law.—I have never found that a discussion in this House got rid of any heresy. [Laughter.]

The conception of a world-league can hardly be expected to make rapid progress in France while the thought so widely prevails there of a "war after the war" in an economic sense; nor should we forget that wars give a strong impulse to the spirit of nationality, which preëminently characterizes the French people. A league to "enforce" peace on all the members would necessarily involve a material concession from views heretofore maintained as to national sovereignty. Moreover, it is not improbable that the vast debts created by the present war will tend to stimulate commercial competition and to encourage the adoption of criminatory tariffs. In addition to this, a great impetus probably will be given to the establishment within colonial empires of the policy of internal trade preferences, thus constituting vast trading units and to a certain extent restoring, especially if most-favored-nation clauses be abandoned or narrowly interpreted, the system of commercial exclusion on which the wars of the eighteenth century so largely turned.

In a remarkable address at the adjourned general meeting of the Cunard Steamship Company, at Liverpool, on the 17th of July last, the chairman of the company, Sir Alfred Booth, Bt., in an enumeration of the principal dangers which he expected to follow the war, mentioned the following:

(3). An attempt to place in the hands of some international authority the task of dividing up the raw materials of the world among all competing industries. This means making politics and not price the determining factor of distribution. The international jealousies engendered by such a system would be quite sufficient to kill any League of Nations we might have hoped to form.

The distinguished chairman evidently did not speak without reflection.

At the moment there are no definite signs that the present great conflict will be followed by conditions that make for friendship and tranquillity. In May, 1914, I ventured the statement, the grounds of which were duly set forth, that the boasts often heard, of the great advance, in recent years, in the practice and conception of international arbitration were not justified by the facts. This statement was characterized as "pessimitic," but its substantial accuracy was strikingly confirmed by what happened before the end of the summer. Those who were then "optimistic" now clamor for a "governed" world, as a panacea for the ills to which humanity has heretofore been subject. But the remedy is not new nor is the demand novel. Since the dawn of recorded history men have been trying to have a "governed" world, but unfortunately have fought over the question who should govern it. Racial feelings, different political conceptions, varied and conflicting economic needs and ambitions have impelled and still impel them to do so.

As to the manner in which the war will be brought to a close, there seems to be a certain confusion, if we judge by current phrases. We hear much of a "negotiated" peace as the antithesis of a "dictated" peace. Those who use these phrases would, if called upon to justify them, find difficulty in so doing. No doubt what they usually mean by a "negotiated" peace is a peace founded on a compromise or bargain, in which certain conditions which they wish to see maintained would be sacrificed or abandoned; but, for such a thought, the word "negotiated" is quite inappropriate. The United States may fairly be said to have dictated terms to Spain in 1898, but the treaty of peace was the result of more than two months' negotiations. Terms may be said to have been "dictated" by the victorious to the defeated powers after the Thirty Years' War, but the Peace of Westphalia was the result of several years' negotiations. The allies "dictated" terms to France at the close of the Napoleonic wars, as did Germany in 1871, but there were treaties of peace and these treaties were the result of negotiations. It would be idle to cite hundreds of other examples. It is true that the attitude of President Lincoln towards the Confederacy has been hastily commended as suitable to the present occasion; but the difficulty with the analogy is its want of foundation. The Confederate States having undertaken to secede, the only question at issue was that of their renewed submission to the national Constitution and laws, which they had themelves helped to make. These contained all that was necessary. A treaty of peace would have been requisite only in case the effort to restore the national authority had failed. The parties to the present conflict are independent nations. When, how, and on what conditions negotiations shall be undertaken, are questions to be determined on their merits; but, unless the war should end, as perhaps no one contemplates or even desires, in the complete absorption of the one group by the other, it will be closed by a treaty of peace, and the treaty will be preceded by negotiations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Czecho-Slovak Nation

By THOMAS G. MASARYK.

IN one of his latest speeches the German Emperor characterized this war as a struggle between American and German (Prussian) ideals. In fact, the war is a struggle between democracy and theocratic monarchism, the latter represented by Prussia, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey. In this struggle the Czecho-Slovak nation joined the Allies; for it is our nation which initiated the Reformation, opposed Austria and the Germans, and which all the time was struggling for the modern principles of democracy and revolution. It was the principles of the American and French revolution which strengthened our national revival and opposition to Austria. The war, and the rôle which our nation is playing in it, is thus not a single temporary phenomenon, but an organic link in the whole historic chain.

Immediately after the declaration of war the whole Czecho-Slovak nation arraigned itself against Austria-Hungary and Germany on the side of the Allies. The movement was spontaneous and general. The Austrian Government cancelled all liberties of its citizens; there was no Parliament, all political parties were placed under police surveillance, newspapers were muzzled or suppressed, political meetings forbidden—in short, the war abroad was accompanied by terror at home. An open opposition to the war and to Austria was begun by the Czecho-Slovak soldiers. They refused to fight, surrendered to the enemy *en masse,* and soon formed Czecho-Slovak legions in the Allied armies. The movement was wholly popular and spontaneous. We have our different political parties, but our political maturity is shown in the unanimous attitude on the question of the war and its meaning; and in that respect there are no party divisions among the Czechs.

The national movement is very strong. The most cruel terrorism, the decimation of our regiments, the hangings and shootings at home, the confiscation of property and the jailing of citizens were of no avail. The Polish deputy Daszynski declared in the Austrian Parliament that the Emperor Francis Joseph had ordered the execution of some 30,000 to 60,000 civilians (not only men, but women and children, have been brutally murdered) in the first two years of the war, in order to hold his position against the Czechs and the rest of the non-German and non-Magyar nationalities of his Empire. The Emperor Charles tried new tactics: he promised coronation, federalization, and autonomy, but without results; our nation does not, cannot, and will not believe the Hapsburgs. It stands on the firm basis of our historical rights for complete independence. The Czech nation elected the Hapsburgs to its throne; the Czech lands did not come under Austria by conquest; the Czechs are still independent even though the Austro-Germans and Magyars, under the leadership of Berlin, are trying to deprive them of their rights.

In this situation, in complete understanding and with the unanimous approval of the people at home, the Czecho-Slovak National Council was formed. The Council, being in fact the provisional Government, organized the Czech and Slovak colonies in the Allied and neutral countries; it also organized the army, and in its declaration of November 14, 1915, it declared the Hapsburgs deposed from the throne of Bohemia. The Czecho-Slovak state must be a republic. We have elected the Hapsburgs to the throne of Bohemia, and we have therefore the right to cancel our contract with them; we do not recognize their theocratic origin or divine right. They have existed by the will of the nation, and by the will of the same nation they cease to be the lords of Bohemia. They violated the mutual agreement by their anti-Czech activities; they are guilty of this war, and they are an obstacle to the sound development of Europe. The recognition afforded to our army and National Council by the Allies is the recognition of historical development and historical necessity. Austria originated in the union of three States—Bohemia, Hungary, and (German) Austria, against the Turkish danger. With the disappearance of this danger she has lost her *raison d'être.*

The Czecho-Slovak army in Russia, France, and Italy has been formed of prisoners of war who were set free by the Russian Government, not only under the old régime, but also by the Kerensky and Bolshevik Governments, and who entered the army as free Czecho-Slovak citizens. Last spring the army in Russia passed under the military and financial administration of the Allies and was declared a part of the army in France. France, Italy, Great Britain, the United States, and Japan recognized the army as an Allied regular force. Our army, then, fighting on three fronts—in France, Italy, and Russia—is, on the basis of our historical and natural rights, a regular army; the Austrians have no right to proclaim us traitors; our revolution is fully justified by the democratic effort for the restitution of our rights and independence.

Recognition by the Allies makes the Czecho-Slovak question an international question; not simply an internal question of Austro-Hungarian policy, as the Austrians and Magyars maintain. It has in fact always been an international question, but the Allies paid little attention to political matters in eastern Europe until the war aroused general attention and taught the nations the significance of the Czecho-Slovak and the other eastern European questions. The recognition of our army and National Council, accordingly, must have a bearing on the peace conference, in which Czech delegates, I hope, will participate. Clearly, also, the recognition of the Czecho-Slovak National Council means that the Allies, recognizing our independence, no longer think of preserving Austria-Hungary in her integrity.

Austria-Hungary issued an official declaration against the British recognition. In Germany Solf, and later von Hertling, spoke against it. Both maintain that our National Council is a private committee, that only a small part of the army is Czech or Slovak, and that we have no territory. In reply, I call attention to the fact that last spring the Emperor Charles sent his delegate to our army in Russia to persuade it to return home, with the assurance that all its members would receive amnesty, and that the nation would obtain full autonomy. Similar advances were made to our leaders at home. The army, however, after a four days' battle at Bachmatch, defeated the Germans, and the German commander asked for a truce, which was granted, although the Commander-in-chief, General Linsingen, subsequently cancelled the agreement. It is not true that we have no territory, for the whole nation is with us unani-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mously, as is continually proclaimed by the political leaders at home. Serbia and Montenegro had for some time no territory, but they nevertheless had an army; Belgium has control of only a small part of its territory, but it has an army. We have an army in Russia, France and Italy—a much larger army than Belgium or Serbia has to-day; and an independent army is always considered one of the chief attributes of sovereignty.

If the Allies recognize the right of Italy to the Italian provinces of Austria, then Austria-Hungary cannot be preserved in her integrity; the same result follows from a recognition of the claims of the Rumanians, Jugoslavs, and Poles. If a United Poland is to exist, a part of Galicia must be included in it; the Rumanians have a natural right to the Rumanian provinces in Bukovina, Transylvania, and Hungary, and the Jugoslavs to their territories in Croatia, Slavonia, Hungary, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Istria, Carniola, Carinthia and Styria. Nor must the Ruthenians (Ukrainians) in Galicia, Bukovina, and Hungary be forgotten. In the same way the Czecho-Slovaks have a right to their full independence. The dismemberment of Austria-Hungary will also best help Russia. Between Germany and Russia there will arise free Poland, Bohemia, and Slovakia, United Rumania and Jugoslavia; the Italian provinces of Austria will be joined to Italy. The Germans and Magyars will be surrounded by a wall of these Slav and Latin nations. Russia will cease to be a neighbor of Prussia; she will be saved from the direct influence of Berlin, and the Russians and the nationalities of the Russian federation will be able to develop more freely.

The friends of Austria-Hungary try to persuade us and themselves that small nations cannot exist, but that they must join in a federation. Austria, they say, is such a federation. Austria was a federation as long as its component states, Bohemia, Hungary and Austria, were independent; for a federation, as the examples of Switzerland, the United States and Germany show, presupposes the freedom of its component parts. A free Bohemia may federate with another free state, if she likes. Austria-Hungary, however, is not a federation, but a state originated in and maintained by force. The contention that small states and nations cannot exist is contradicted by history. Of the twenty-seven states in Europe, twenty-one are small.

The Pan-Germanists long since made it clear that Austria-Hungary is the chief instrument of the German "Drang nach Osten." That was Bismarck's policy after 1866, and it has been the German policy up to the present time. Without Austria-Hungary, Germany would be obliged to depend on her own national forces. Austria-Hungary is for Germany a bridge to the Balkans, and thence to Asiatic Turkey and Africa. That is the reason why Germany in this war has so strenuously defended Austria. Germany will willingly give up Belgium, all French territory, even Alsace-Lorraine, if Austria-Hungary is preserved in its entirety, because Austria is the German vanguard to the East and a protection against Russia. Germany is looking towards the East, and for her progress in that direction the Eastern Empire of Austria-Hungary is the necessary instrument. Austria will never turn against Germany; it cannot. Austria is gravitating in the same direction as Prussia—towards the East; the Hapsburgs are basing their strength on the Germans and Magyars, and in a true Prussian spirit against the Slavs and Latins.

The dismemberment of Austria, so her defenders say, will strengthen Germany by adding to her domain the German parts of Austria. I do not think that the Hapsburgs will join Germany; they will rather vegetate as a sort of small Byzantine empire. On the whole, however, the problem is one of arithmetic: which is greater, 51 or 7? At present Germany has all of Austria-Hungary, with 51,000,000 of people, at her disposal; after dismemberment she would have only the German provinces with about seven millions. (The German minorities in Hungary and Bohemia will not be joined to Germany.)

The Czecho-Slovak state will be an effective barrier against Germany. The Czechs are the westernmost anti-German wedge: in their more than a thousand years of struggle with Germany they have became hardened, and know how to defend themselves. Bismarck said that whoever is the master of Bohemia is the master of Europe, and the Pan-Germanists know why they are the sworn enemies of our nation. Even the historian Mommsen did not hesitate to incite the Germans to break our hard skulls. The Czecho-Slovak state will not be one of the smallest in Europe. It will be formed of the so-called lands of the Bohemian Crown (Bohemia, Moravia, and Austrian Silesia) and of Slovakia (the northern part of Hungary). This territory is four times larger than Belgium; the population would amount to twelve or thirteen million, depending on how the national minorities are disposed of. Of Czechs and Slovaks there are ten millions. In size the Czecho-Slovak state would be the eighth in Europe.

In all the Allied countries the correct understanding of the Czecho-Slovak question made slow progress during the war; for the fact that the French, the British, and the Americans were fighting only the Germans made it possible to forget Austria. The strength of Austrophilism lay for a time in the fact that Rome was working for the Hapsburgs. Austria-Hungary is the last great Catholic state. The greatest and most authoritative organ of the German Catholics, published in Cologne, some years ago applied the term "mire" to Austrian Catholicism; and after the defeat in Galicia at the beginning of the war the same paper repeated its verdict, and demanded a radical reform in head and members. But the Hapsburgs are not defending either religion or Catholicism, but rather have degraded the Austrian Catholic church to an inexpensive spiritual police. For that reason, not only in Bohemia but also among the Jugoslavs and everywhere else, the Catholic people and Catholic parties are opposed to Austria. With Rome there go the international financiers who fear for the Austrian public debt. They forget that the new states into which Austria will be divided will each take over its share of the public debt as it was before the war; at least, that is a part of the Czecho-Slovak programme. The war debts incurred since 1914 must of course be paid by the Hapsburgs.

Another peculiar form of Austrophilism is entertained by the German-Austrian Socialists and a section of the Liberals in all countries. They admit that Austria cannot remain as it is, and they therefore demand reforms, and primarily autonomy or even federation for the Austro-Hungarian nationalities. Autonomy in Austria has no meaning. It is the principle of democracy which is at stake. National autonomy will not transform the Hapsburgs, nor will it transform the Germans and Magyars; Austria will still remain an instrument of Germany. A real federation presupposes the freedom of the federating nations; the free nations will themselves decide whether or not they wish to

LIBRARY WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

federate, and with whom. When the Austrian Premier, Hussarek, was said to have proposed federation, and even so in very indistinct terms, Germany immediately declared with emphasis that it would not allow the federalization of Austria.

So far as the Socialists are concerned, the German Socialists of Austria follow Scheidemann, Renner, Pernerstorfer, Bauer. The well-known writers and leaders of the German-Austrian Socialists are first of all Germans, and they misuse the Marxian economic materialism to defend great states against small ones. The Czecho-Slovak and Polish Socialists do not accept the argument of the German Socialists. Internationalism, as it is invoked by the Austrophiles, is not menaced by nationalism. On the contrary, true internationalism, the organization of all conscious and enlightened nations, will be made possible by liberating the oppressed nations. We do not accept an internationalism that has been bought at the price of enslaving a great number of nations.

Finally, one hears the argument that the German minorities in the new national states might be endangered. The question of the national minorities is admittedly a serious one. The peace congress will very probably conclude that there should be as few of them as possible, and that they should be as small as possible. So long as they exist, however, the democratic rule of the majority must be put into effect. Is it more just, for instance, that ten million Czechs and Slovaks should be oppressed by Austria-Hungary, than that the Germans in Bohemia and Slovakia, numbering only three millions, possess national freedom constitutionally guaranteed? In Bohemia, German minorities will exist because of the large and peculiar intermixture of the two nations. The Czecho-Slovaks claim the historical boundaries of Bohemia, because they have many large minorities in the German cities and on German territory.

To sum up: the Czecho-Slovak nation invokes the principles of the Declaration of Independence for its revolution. On that basis the United States has given recognition to various revolutionary movements, and we are convinced that there is not and cannot be a more just case before the political forum of the world than our case against the Hapsburgs. The United States cannot accept Austrianism, for it is a denial and a contradiction of the Declaration of Iedependence and of American ideals. We value the recognition by the United States for reasons of principle: we consider the great American republic to be the mother of modern democracy. Her recognition, accordingly, is of special value to us.

The Mexican Oil Problem*

By FREDERIC R. KELLOGG

THE phrase "Mexican Oil Problem" is a misleading one as descriptive of the issues which have been raised between the Government of the Mexican Republic and the oil-producing companies. The questions involved are not merely Mexican questions nor are they oil questions. They are simply the old fundamental ones of right and wrong; and the problem, instead of being, as is commonly supposed, a complicated and difficult one, is, on the contrary, absolutely simple, and one in respect of which it would seem that the proper conclusion must inevitably be reached by any one who understands the essential facts. The object of this article is to ask attention to a brief statement of these facts.

1. The commercial oil development in Mexico dates from the year 1900, when Edward L. Doheny and Charles A. Canfield, of Los Angeles, California, purchased their first properties in that republic.

2. These properties were purchased from private owners, who held by a continuous chain of private titles running back more than three hundred years.

3. Not a single acre of oil land was acquired directly or indirectly from the Mexican Government or nation. The only assistance which the Mexican Government rendered to this new enterprise was the aid authorized by a general law of the Republic under which a person starting a new industry was entitled to be exempt from import taxes for a period of ten years.

4. This development was undertaken against the all but unanimous judgment of the leading Mexicans who knew about it, was prosecuted under new conditions both geographically, geologically, and commercially which subjected its owners to great risks, and only began to be successful after four years of unremitting effort continued through a period of financial difficulties which almost reduced the operators to bankruptcy.

5. These purchases were made and this development was undertaken in reliance upon the express provisions of Mexican law distinctly enunciated in the Mining law adopted in 1884, sixteen years previously. These principles were subsequently reëmbodied in the laws of 1892 and 1910.

In the law of 1884 the following provisions are found (the italics are the writer's):

Art. 10. *The following substances are the exclusive property of the owner of the land,* who may, therefore, develop and enjoy them without the formality of denouncement or special adjudication:

I. Ore bodies of the several varieties of coal.

II. The rocks on the land and substances of the soil such as limestone, slate, porphyry, basalt, building stone, soils, sands, and all other analogous substances.

III. Substances not specified in Section II, Article 1, to be found in placers, such as iron, tin, and all loose surface minerals.

IV. Salts found on the surface, fresh and salt water, whether surface or subterranean; *petroleum* and gaseous springs, or springs of warm or medicinal waters.

No law could have set forth a clearer or more unequivocal declaration of the rights which oil producers could acquire by a purchase of the land.

6. It goes without saying that the law of 1884 was not adopted at the instance of American oil producers or intending oil producers, for it was passed sixteen years before the first attempt at commercial oil production was made by any American.

7. The fact that this pioneer effort had, contrary to the belief of all of the Mexican officials, been successful began

*An article by another writer, discussing the Mexican oil problem from a Mexican point of view will appear later in the International Relations section.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be generally known in Mexico in 1904 and 1905. In the latter year an effort was made, at the instance of a prominent Mexican, to obtain from the Academy of Jurisprudence in Mexico, an organization composed of all the leading members of the bar of the Republic, a declaration to the effect that no legal or constitutional objection existed to the taking over by the nation of the ownership of all petroleum measures underlying the surface of private property. The matter was discussed most elaborately and by the best legal talent in Mexico, and resulted in a declaration, in which all of the members of the Academy except the mover of the resolution joined, that such a course of action was legally impossible.

8. Subsequent to this date, Messrs. Doheny and Canfield acquired control, by purchase or lease from private owners, of additional areas of petroleum lands; and other oil enterprises, learning of this new field, hastened to make similar contracts of purchase and lease and to begin the development of the region.

9. Neither Messrs. Doheny nor Canfield nor their successor, the Huasteca Petroleum Company (the largest producer of petroleum in Mexico) has ever obtained a concession or grant of any nature from the Government of Mexico covering a single square foot of oil lands; their contracts of purchase or lease having been made in every case with private owners who held under titles extending back in many instances more than two hundred and fifty years. The same is true of every American concern that has entered the Mexican field. A few so-called "concessions" have been granted to Mexicans, but in no instance do they cover lands believed to be of any substantial value, and they have not to date resulted in the production of a single barrel of petroleum. According to my recollection all of these concessions were granted by the Madero (the revolutionary) Government.

A concession was also granted by the Government of Mexico to a Mexican company owned by the leading English oil interests. Up to the present time no petroleum development whatever has taken place under it, and it covers no known petroleum land of any value.

In this connection it is to be noted that all of the best oil lands which have heretofore been discovered in Mexico are located in the State of Vera Cruz, along the border of the Gulf of Mexico, *and that in that region there are not now, and have not been since the development of this industry began, any national lands of any importance above high water mark,* practically all of this territory having been for centuries the subject-matter of private ownership.

10. Lack of knowledge of the facts above alluded to has been the chief cause, in my opinion, of the erroneous ideas that have existed as to the Mexican oil situation; for the impression has prevailed even in high quarters in this country that the Mexican oil producers were "grafting concessionaires" who, by underhanded methods, had induced the former authorities of the Mexican Republic to make a wanton and gross sacrifice of the natural resources owned and controlled by the country.

Thus, there appeared in the *Nation,* under date of August 31, the statement that "Dictator Diaz stole these resources and distributed the loot among foreign concessionaires, to his own profit and the profit of his associates in England and France." There is no basis of fact for this statement. No natural "resources" were "stolen" or in any way obtained by any foreign concessionaires, except as above stated. The law of 1884 was passed in the time of Gonzalez, and not of Diaz. The latter died in poverty and never had a dollar of benefit directly or indirectly from any American petroleum concern.

11. In reliance upon the provisions of the Mexican law above quoted, American concerns have, since 1900, made enormous investments in the purchase or acquisition by lease or contract, in many instances at high prices, of oil lands, and in the establishment of a very large system for the collection, distribution, transportation, and refining of the product of these fields—all of which has redounded immensely to the advantage of Mexico and its citizens in the form of taxes, wages, royalties, supplies, etc. Every dollar of this investment was made in reliance upon the guaranties of the Mexican Constitution of 1857 and upon the laws, the declarations, the announced policy, and the good faith of the Mexican Government.

12. No change in these laws was made or suggested until the adoption of the Constitution of 1917, in which a clause is found declaring that the Mexican Republic possesses what is called "direct dominion" over petroleum. Pursuant to two other clauses in the Constitution, the instrument itself was declared to be one of the "laws" of the land, and express provision was made that no "law" should be given retroactive effect. In other words, this instrument, interpreted in the light of its own express provisions as well as in the light of the general principles of construction which obtain in civilized nations, should not properly be construed as purporting to take away the vested rights of those who had already acquired them in reliance upon the preëxisting laws of the republic.

13. No attempt was made to formulate any law construing the Constitution and putting it into effect until February, 1918, when the first of a series of decrees relating to the subject was issued. These decrees were not laws of the Mexican Republic and are believed to be wholly without legal sanction. The Mexican Congress was not in session, and the preceding Congress had omitted to legislate. Hence these decrees were simply executive acts promulgated by the President of the Republic.

The original decree of February was superseded by another decree dated July 31 and by still another dated August 14. It is impossible and unnecessary within the present space limits to discuss in detail the provisions of these decrees, but in substance they embody an executive interpretation of the Constitution which directly violates its precept against retroactivity in that the Constitution is considered as sweeping away, at one stroke, although with no pretence of compensation, all of the rights of every nature which the petroleum concerns had acquired and paid for pursuant to the laws of Mexico. They declare that the nation, and not the petroleum producers, owns all these rights; they impose upon the producers the obligation to pay a rental in respect of the properties which they claim to own; and they purport to compel the producers to take various steps which amount to an abandonment of their claim of absolute title and to receive in exchange therefor a mere license to operate, to be issued by the Mexican Government and to be attended by such conditions as to rentals and otherwise as the Government may from time to time see fit to impose. A serious question also exists as to whether, even upon these onerous terms, any rights whatever will be allowed to be acquired by the foreign companies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In other words, the situation created by these decrees is the same as that which would exist if the Government of the United States should approach a man who owns a house and lot in fee simple and should tell him that he no longer is the owner of this property, that it belongs to the Government, and that the Government does not intend to pay him anything for it, but will allow him to continue to keep it provided he pays any rental which may now or in the future be demanded for the privilege of so doing, and provided he also agrees to subject himself to any other conditions as to the manner of use of the premises which the Government may think it advisable to impose upon him.

14. Various efforts have been made in declarations by official and non-official Mexicans to cover up or obscure the effect of this construction of the Constitutional provision by the decrees in question. All such disguises, however, have been brushed aside, and it is now made perfectly clear by official declarations of the highest Mexican authorities that the intention is to do exactly what has been stated—to substitute the Mexican nation in place of the oil companies as the owner of these great oil measures discovered, bought, paid for, and developed before the new Constitution was thought of—and to do so without compensation. It is only necessary upon this point to quote from the speech of President Carranza at the opening of Congress on September 1, 1918, in which he said: "The Constitution of 1917 destroyed the legal system derived from the mining code of 1884."

15. The theory upon which this remarkable proposition is advanced is that petroleum was the property of the nation prior to 1884; that this right of ownership was of such a nature that it could not be surrendered or abandoned; that the law of 1884 and subsequent laws are, therefore, wholly invalid, and that the nation is, as President Carranza stated, "simply recovering in the exercise of its rights" the petroleum deposits in question.

Naturally the details of this argument and of its refutation cannot here be considered. As a matter of fact, the claim is, in my opinion, without any substantial foundation whatever either in law or in history. But the point which I wish especially to emphasize is that even if, technically speaking, this claim were well founded, it should nevertheless be inconceivable to any right-minded man that after the Mexican Republic has for thirty-four years expressly repudiated any such theory; after enormous investments and obligations have been undertaken by citizens of friendly nations in good faith and in reliance upon the invitation of the Mexican Government as shown by its preceding legislation; after the Mexican Government has recognized the legitimacy of this new industry by imposing upon it and receiving from it millions of dollars in taxes and in many other ways; after the present Administration was recognized *de facto* by the American Government in reliance upon a specific written pledge to respect international obligations, the Mexican Government can now be allowed completely to reverse its position, and absolutely to deprive the individuals and companies who have relied upon Mexico's good faith of the property which they acquired pursuant to its laws; and to do this without even a suggestion of compensation for the enormous property values thus taken away.

This is the fundamental proposition of the Mexican oil situation. If such things can be brought to pass, it does not seem an exaggeration to say that Germany was justified in her invasion of Belgium, and that the principles of international good faith for which this country is expending thousands of precious lives and billions of treasure are futile and void.

16. One vital point which must be kept in mind is that the questions at issue relate in no particular to the subject of taxation. An attempt has been made to stigmatize the oil companies as "tax dodgers." There is no justification for such a suggestion. The oil companies always have paid and always will pay any legitimate taxes upon their business and their property. Under the decrees above discussed the moneys which they are required to pay are not taxes, *but are distinctly defined as rentals and royalties* in respect of their own properties. It is impossible for the oil companies to pay these sums upon the basis specified without admitting that they do not own the properties to which they certainly believe themselves to be morally and legally entitled.

17. In view of the facts which have been set forth, what wonder that the oil companies have opposed, and will oppose to the end, the attacks to which they are being subjected? And what wonder that the Governments of the United States, of England, and of France have protested against so unjust a policy? The marvel is that those who now guide the destinies of Mexico should have failed to see the colossal harm which they are doing to their own country's credit and good name by the course of repudiation and confiscation which they have elected to pursue.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
Henry Goddard Leach, American Scandinavian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Náon, Argentine Ambassador.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

Contributors to this Issue

JOHN BASSETT MOORE is professor of international law and diplomacy in Columbia University.

THOMAS G. MASARYK is president of the National Czecho-Slovak Council.

FREDERIC R. KELLOGG is the general counsel of the Mexican Petroleum Company.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documents

The Allies and the Murman Council

THE following text of an agreement between the Allies and the Murman Council, "transmitted through the wireless stations of the Russian Government," was published in the London *Times* on July 24. The agreement should not be confused with the official announcement issued on August 22 by the Entente Allied Governments in the northern region of Russia, and printed in American papers of August 26.

The General Assembly of the Murman Regional Council has sanctioned without opposition the following agreement, which is temporary in character and made necessary by special circumstances, between the representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France, and the Presidium of the Murman Regional Council:

Item 1.—The present agreement, which has to be sanctioned by the Governments of the Allies, is concluded between the representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France, on the one side, and the representatives of the Murman Regional Council, on the other side, with the object of securing coordinated action on the part of those who have signed this agreement, for the defence of the Murman region against the Powers of the German coalition. For the purpose of obtaining this aim both the signing parties take upon themselves the obligation to support each other mutually.

Item 2.—The Murman region is composed of the former Alexandrovsk district of the province of Archangel.

Item 3.—All detachments of Russian armed forces of the Murman region, alike those which already exist and those which will be formed, will be under the direction of the Russian Military Command appointed by the Murman Regional Council. (Remark.—It is recognized as very desirable that an independent Russian army should be created, but with the object of obtaining more speedily the principal aim of this agreement the admission of Russian volunteers into the Allied forces is permitted. In the case of such admissions it is to be taken as recognized that of these volunteers no independent Russian detachments shall be formed, but that, as far as circumstances permit, the detachments should be composed only of an equal number of foreigners and Russians.)

Item 4.—The representatives of Great Birtain, the United States of North America, and France will give to the Russian Command necessary help in equipments, supplies, and transports and for the instruction of the Russian armed forces which are formed.

Item 5.—The whole authority in the internal administration of the region belongs without qualification to the Murman Regional Council.

Item 6.—The representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France and their agents will not interfere in the home affairs of the region. In all matters in which it may be found necessary to have the support of the local population, the representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France and their agents will address themselves to the respective Russian authorities and not directly to the population, excepting in the belt along the front, in which the orders of the Military Command, justified by the conditions of field service, must be obeyed unconditionally by all. The conditions for entrance into and departure from the Murman region will be determined by the Murman Regional Council, which will take into consideration the state of war in which the region is involved and the necessity for most energetic precaution against espionage. Salaries and the standard of labor productivity will be established by the Murman Regional Council.

Item 7.—In view of the impossibility of importing the necessary food from Russia the representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France promise, as far as it shall be possible, to secure food to the Murman Regional Council for the whole population of the region, including all immigrant workmen with their families, the rations to equal in food value the rations which the privates of the Allied armed forces in Murman are receiving.

Item 8.—The distribution of food among the population is to be carried out by trustworthy Russian troops.

Item 9.—The representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France promise to secure, as far as may be possible, the importation of manufactured goods and other articles of the first necessity.

Item 10.—The representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France promise as far as it may be possible to secure to the Murman Regional Council all necessary materials and implements for technical equipment and supplies so that it may carry out its programme of construction which has been elaborated by mutual agreement. In this agreement, first, the requirements of war-time are taken into consideration; secondly, the development of international trade intercourse; and, thirdly, the local fisheries.

Item 11.—All expenses which may be incurred by the Governments of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France as the result of this agreemeent are to be set down to the account of the respective Powers.

Item 12.—The representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France recognize that their Governments must give the necessary financial assistance to the Murman Regional Council.

Item 13.—The present agreement comes into force from the moment of its ratification by the Murman Regional Council, and will remain in force as long as normal relations between the Russian Central Authority on the one side and the Murman Regional Council and the Governments of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France on the other side, are not reëstablished.

Item 14.—Before signing this agreement the representatives of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France, in the name of their Governments, again affirm the absence of any purpose of conquest in respect to the Murman region as a whole or in regard to any of its parts. The Presidium of the Murman Regional Council before the Russian people, and the Governments of Great Britain, the United States of North America, and France declares that the only object of this agreement is to guard the integrity of the Murman region for a Great United Russia.

The original of this agreement has been signed by the Presidium of the Murman Regional Council and by the representatives of the above-named Powers.

The agreement was sanctioned by the Murman Regional Council on July 7.

The Socialist Congress at Paris

THE following resolutions, intended to be laid before the Paris conference of the Socialist party, October 6-10, by the Committee for the Defence of International Socialism, are translated from the *Populaire* (Paris) of September 14.

The Socialist party proclaims, more loudly than ever, its wish to remain faithful to the principles which were preëminent at the creation of the unity of the party and which developed its action and its forces up to the outbreak of the war.

These principles which have had to suffer, in the course of the terrible crisis through which Socialism has passed in four years, regretable attacks, in spite of the persevering efforts which the party, at its last national council, at length solemnly approved ought now, in a definitive fashion, to be reconfirmed in their full force.

The party considers that the world crisis, foreseen and prophesied by it, has only succeeded in confirming in its eyes the necessity for the disappearance of capitalistic society, and of its replacement by a régime in which, class antagonism no longer existing, antagonism between nations will also cease to exist. Once more it declares its solidarity in regard to the national defence, which assures by the continuance of their sacrifice the soldiers of the Republic, who have had, during these four years of war, to triumph not only over the forces of the enemy, but also over the faults of the command, at the same time that they have had to endure, in the prolongation of their sufferings, the consequences of a policy blindly bellicose and directed by imperialistic ambitions.

At the same time that it affirms its devotion to the national defence, the party renews the expression of its attachment to the Internationale.

More than ever the workers of the universe need an effective bond. It is the Internationale alone which can prepare a lasting peace of the peoples, by abolishing the control of finance and of large industry over public affairs, and by destroying the hatreds cunningly fostered by the leaders between various human groups. It is the Internationale alone which can establish Socialism in the world.

The Congress affirms that Socialism, in France as elsewhere, should pursue its task with complete sovereignty and full autonomy, without accepting a collaboration with the bourgeois groups which would weaken its prestige and its action by associating it with authority and involving it in grave responsibilities. It repudiates all new experiments in collaboration, deeming that those of the past suffice to judge the value of similar tactics, and that the latter have resulted only in arming reaction within imperialism without.

The party will energetically defend public liberties, compromised by the policy of abdication called the *union sacrée*. It urges

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the working class to safeguard the republican régime. It opposes violations of individual rights as well as violations of the rights of the proletariat. It protests against the judgments and arbitrary acts which have struck at organized labor, notably the representatives of labor in war industries. It denounces the scandalous decision of the High Court of Justice, rendered contrary to the laws and from subserviency to authority. It denounces the alliance of the Clemenceau Cabinet with the champions of royalty and the remnants of Bonapartism.

The party proclaims the duty, for the working class, of multiplying its efforts to put an end at last to the bloody conflict. More than ever before the working class can, by exerting its force in all the belligerent countries at once, impose a people's peace. Opposed by Governments, the International Socialist Conference ought to be held as soon as possible. It alone can seize the arms of all militarisms, search with sincerity for the most just conditions of peace, set itself furiously against imperialisms, and take all possible precautions that this war may not leave behind it hatreds that would light the fires of new conflicts.

The French Socialist party declares itself ready to respond immediately to the call of comrades Huysmans, Branting, and Troelstra, charged with the task of preparing the meeting of the Internationale. It is because they fear the growth in prestige of the proletariat that the Governments of the two belligerent coalitions fetter the liberty of the working classes and oppose the meeting of the conference. The Socialist and syndicalist organizations ought to unite their efforts everywhere to force the will of the public authorities and obtain the necessary conditions for that meeting. The French Socialist party makes its own the resolution adopted on this subject at the Trades Union Congress by more than 4,000,000 English workers, the text of which is:

"The Congress, in view of the refusal of the Government to give passport facilities to delegates regularly chosen by the organized working class, condemns this policy of the Government and declares that if it is to be continued, the organized labor movement must of necessity take up the challenge which has been thrown down. The Congress warns the Government that the patience of the organized workers is rapidly being exhausted in the face of the continued affronts which are offered them."

It is under the inspiration of the sentiment expressed with so much force by the English workers, that the party ought to array itself against any Government which opposes again the meeting of the Internationale, as it ought to array itself against any Government making a compact with reaction, welcoming imperialistic programmes, setting aside acceptable proposals of peace, or defying the working class and its organizations.

Against these manifestations of a reactionary policy without and within the country, the party authorizes its Committee on Political Action and its elected members to use all the means in their power, according to circumstances, to bring about the refusal of credits. It associates itself completely with the decisions made by the General Confederation of Labor at its last Congress to take, as occasion arises, both Parliamentary and extra-Parliamentary action.

The party denounces with all its force the course taken in Russia and Siberia by official France and its allies, which strikes at the rights of the Russian people. It judges that this intervention, criminal in principle, is also profoundly dangerous, because it excites the anger of the masses of the Russian people against France and also favors Prussian militarism.

The Socialist party protests against the treatment to which the French and Allied leaders have subjected the Russian revolution, recalling too much that which the combined sovereigns tried to inflict on the French Revolution.

The Socialist party recalls that it has always claimed for all peoples the right to dispose freely of themselves from the national point of view, as also the right determining freely their appropriate institutions. It declares that it will work with all its strength during the elaboration of the treaties of peace in behalf of all the national claims which are legitimate and actually realizable. But it is obliged to add that it does not expect of the war, directed on both sides by capitalistic states eaten up by lust of territory and desires for annexations, a wholly just decision of all these questions. It energetically opposes every programme which, under the pretext of achieving a certain end, would work to the prolongation of the conflict. It is the universal development of the political power of the working classes which will prepare or partially realize this settlement; it is the triumph of international Socialism which will establish it definitively, by grounding on an indestructible basis the liberty of all peoples as well as of all individuals.

With the same idea the party recalls that it has always not only upheld but also encouraged, by its action against war, the initiative of those who have attempted in society as it is to assure to the nations a minimum of peace guarantees. Moreover, it is in accord with all the efforts which shall be sincerely made to build as solidly as possible the institutions of arbitration and the society of nations. But it could not, without allowing itself the most shameful deviations, make any such claim an object of war, and it would fail in its deepest aim if it did not warn the workers that so long as monarchial rule and the capitalist struggle to conquer markets exist, the peace of the world will be imperiled.

The signing of the peace ought to be the preface to the great work of economic, political and social transformation for which Socialists are fighting. The war, by wiping out or overturning so many homes, by piling up expenses, by indefinitely increasing debts and preparing crushing burdens of taxation, by making it almost impossible for the capitalist state as well as for the proletariat to live, has heaped up the elements of the most formidable revolution the world will ever know. It is in remaining faithful to its eternal principles that Socialism, which foresaw this time, will show itself equal to its tasks.

The Congress of the Socialist party, at this solemn hour of history, asserts that French Socialism will not fail in its task. Anxious to safeguard indispensable unity, it condemns the waywardness of those who seek, by a compromise with bourgeois society, to work out illegitimate solutions. In the reconstruction of the world which they envisage the French proletariat will have no other associates than the proletariat of the Internationale.

President Wilson on Austria-Hungary

THE following extracts comprise all the passages in President Wilson's messages and addresses which refer specifically to Austria-Hungary, with the exception of the note of December 18, 1916, transmitted in identical terms, save for a formal difference of wording in the third paragraph, to all the belligerent Powers, suggesting a statement of their respective peace terms. Passages referring in general terms to the Central Powers or to terms of peace, but without particular reference to Austria-Hungary, are also omitted.

In his address to the Senate, January 22, 1917, on the essential terms of peace, President Wilson said:

So far as practicable, moreover, every great people now struggling towards a full development of its resources and of its powers should be assured a direct outlet to the great highways of the sea. Where this cannot be done by the cession of territory, it can no doubt be done by the neutralization of direct rights of way under the general guarantee which will assure the peace itself. With a right comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.

The application of this passage to Austria-Hungary was first made known in Mr. Wilson's fifth Annual Message, December 4, 1917 (*q. v.*).

April 2, 1917, in an address to Congress, Mr. Wilson recommended a declaration of war against Germany, but not against Austria-Hungary.

I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

Mr. Wilson's message to Russia, delivered to the Provisional Government on May 26, 1917, but not made public in this country until June 9, contains a reference to Germany's influence and designs which includes Austria-Hungary.

The position of America in this war is so clearly avowed that no man can be excused for mistaking it. She seeks no material profit or aggrandizement of any kind. She is fighting for no advantage or selfish object of her own, but for the liberation of peoples everywhere from the aggressions of autocratic force.

The ruling classes in Germany have begun of late to profess a like liberality and justice of purpose, but only to preserve the power they have set up in Germany and the selfish advantages which they have wrongly gained for themselves and their private projects of power all the way from Berlin to Bagdad and beyond. Government after government has by their influence, without open conquest of its territory, been linked together in a net of intrigue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COLLEGE COLLEGE

directed against nothing less than the peace and liberty of the world. The meshes of that intrigue must be broken, but cannot be broken unless wrongs already done are undone; and adequate measures must be taken to prevent it from ever again being re-woven or repaired.

Of course, the Imperial German Government and those whom it is using for their own undoing are seeking to obtain pledges that the war will end in the restoration of the *status quo ante*. It was the *status quo ante* out of which this iniquitous war issued forth, the power of the Imperial German Government within the Empire and its widespread domination and influence outside of that Empire. That status must be altered in such fashion as to prevent any such hideous thing from ever happening again.

In his "Flag Day" address at Washington, June 14, 1917, Mr. Wilson made his first extended reference to the part played by Austria-Hungary in the scheme of a *Mitteleuropa*.

The war was begun by the military masters of Germany, who proved to be also the masters of Austria-Hungary. These men have never regarded nations as peoples, men, women, and children of like blood and frame as themselves, for whom governments existed and in whom governments had their life. They have regarded them merely as serviceable organizations which they could by force or intrigue bend or corrupt to their own purpose. They have regarded the smaller states, in particular, and the peoples who could be overwhelmed by force, as their natural tools and instruments of domination. Their purpose has long been avowed. The statesmen of other nations, to whom that purpose was incredible, paid little attention; regarded what German professors expounded in their classrooms and German writers set forth to the world as the goal of German policy as rather the dream of minds detached from practical affairs, as preposterous private conceptions of German destiny, than as the actual plans of responsible rulers; but the rulers of Germany themselves knew all the while what concrete plans, what well advanced intrigues lay back of what the professors and the writers were saying, and were glad to go forward unmolested, filling the thrones of Balkan states with German princes, putting German officers at the service of Turkey to drill her armies and make interest with her Government, developing plans of sedition and rebellion in India and Egypt, setting their fires in Persia. The demands made by Austria upon Servia were a mere single step in a plan which compassed Europe and Asia, from Berlin to Bagdad. They hoped those demands might not arouse Europe, but they meant to press them whether they did or not, for they thought themselves ready for the final issue of arms.

Their plan was to throw a broad belt of German military power and political control across the very centre of Europe and beyond the Mediterranean into the heart of Asia; and Austria-Hungary was to be as much their tool and pawn as Servia or Bulgaria or Turkey or the ponderous states of the East. Austria-Hungary, indeed, was to become part of the central German Empire, absorbed and dominated by the same forces and influences that had originally cemented the German states themselves. The dream had its heart at Berlin. It could have had a heart nowhere else! It rejected the idea of solidarity of race entirely. The choice of peoples played no part in it at all. It contemplated binding together racial and political units which could be kept together only by force—Czechs, Magyars, Croats, Serbs, Rumanians, Turks, Armenians—the proud states of Bohemia and Hungary, the stout little commonwealths of the Balkans, the indomitable Turks, the subtile peoples of the East. These peoples did not wish to be united. They ardently desired to direct their own affairs, would be satisfied only by undisputed independence. They could be kept quiet only by the presence or the constant threat of armed men. They would live under a common power only by sheer compulsion, and await the day of revolution. But the German military statesmen had reckoned with all that, and were ready to deal with it in their own way.

And they have actually carried the greater part of that amazing plan into execution! Loow how things stand. Austria is at their mercy. It has acted, not upon its own initiative or upon the choice of its own people, but at Berlin's dictation ever since the war began. Its people now desire peace, but cannot have it until leave is granted from Berlin. The so-called Central Powers are in fact but a single Power. Servia is at its mercy, should its hands be but for a moment freed. Bulgaria has consented to its will, and Rumania is overrun. The Turkish armies, which Germans trained, are serving Germany, certainly not themselves, and the guns of German warships lying in the harbor at Constantinople remind Turkish statesmen every day that they have no choice but to take their orders from Berlin. From Hamburg to the Persian Gulf the net is spread.

The plan of a *Mitteleuropa* and Austria-Hungary's relation to it were further discussed by Mr. Wilson in his address before the American Federation of Labor, at Buffalo, November 12, 1917.

. . . I suppose very few of you have thought much about the Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway. The Berlin-Bagdad Railway was constructed in order to run the threat of force down the flank of the industrial undertakings of half a dozen other countries; so that when German competition came in it would not be resisted too far, because there was always the possibility of getting German armies into the heart of that country quicker than any other armies could be got there.

Look at the may of Europe now! Germany in thrusting upon us again and again the discussion of peace, talks—about what? Talks about Belgium; talks about northern France; talks about Alsace-Lorraine. Well, those are deeply interesting subjects to us and to them, but they are not the heart of the matter. Take the map and look at it. Germany has absolute control of Austria-Hungary, practical control of the Balkan states, control of Turkey, control of Asia-Minor. I saw a map in which the whole thing was printed in appropriate black the other day, and the black stretched all the way from Hamburg to Bagdad—the bulk of German power inserted into the heart of the world. If she can keep that, she has kept all that her dreams contemplated when the war began. If she can keep that, her power can disturb the world as long as she keeps it, always provided, for I feel bound to put this proviso in—always provided the present influences that control the German Government continue to control it. I believe that the spirit of freedom can get into the hearts of Germans and find as fine a welcome there as it can find in any other hearts, but the spirit of freedom does not suit the plans of the Pan-Germans. Power cannot be used with concentrated force against free peoples if it is used by free people.

You know how many intimations come to us from one of the Central Powers that it is more anxious for peace than the chief Central Power, and you know that it means that the people in that Central Power know that if the war ends as it stands they will in effect themselves be vassals of Germany, notwithstanding that their populations are compounded of all the peoples of that part of the world, and notwithstanding the fact that they do not wish in their pride and proper spirit of nationality to be so absorbed and dominated. Germany is determined that the political power of the world shall belong to her. There have been such ambitions before. They have been in part realized, but never before have those ambitions been based upon so exact and precise and scientific a plan of domination.

May I not say that it is amazing to me that any group of persons should be so ill-informed as to suppose, as some groups in Russia apparently suppose, that any reforms planned in the interest of the people can live in the presence of a Germany powerful enough to undermine or overthrow them by intrigue or force? Any body of free men that compounds with the present German Government is compounding for its own destruction. But that is not the whole of the story. Any man in America or anywhere else that supposes that the free industry and enterprise of the world can continue if the Pan-German plan is achieved and German power fastened upon the world is as fatuous as the dreamers in Russia. What I am opposed to is not the feeling of the pacifists, but their stupidity. My heart is with them, but my mind has a contempt for them. I want peace, but I know how to get it, and they do not.

In his fifth Annual Message to Congress, December 4, 1917, Mr. Wilson referred at length to German political methods and designs and recommended a declaration of war against Austria-Hungary. It may be recalled that the Czar, Nicholas II, abdicated on March 15, and that a provisional Government was established under which Russia presently ceased to take an active part in the war. The note from which the following passage is taken was made public soon after the arrival of the Root Commission at Petrograd.

Let there be no misunderstanding. Our present and immediate task is to win the war, and nothing shall turn us aside from it until it is accomplished. Every power and resource we possess, whether of men, of money, or of materials, is being devoted and will continue to be devoted to that purpose until it is achieved. Those who desire to bring peace about before that purpose is achieved I counsel to carry their advice elsewhere. We will not entertain it. We shall regord the war as won only when the German people say to us, through properly accredited representatives, that they are ready to agree to a settlement based upon justice and the reparation of the wrongs their rulers have done. They have done a wrong to Belgium which must be repaired. They have established a power over other lands and peoples than their own—over the great Empire of Austria-Hungary, over hitherto free Balkan states, over Turkey, and within Asia—which must be relinquished.

Germany's success by skill, by industry, by knowledge, by enterprise we did not grudge or oppose, but admired, rather. She had built up for herself a real empire of trade and influence, secured

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the peace of the world. We were content to abide the rivalries of manufacture, science, and commerce that were involved for us in her success, and stand or fall as we had or did not have the brains and the initiative to surpass her. But at the moment when she had conspicuously won her triumphs of peace she threw them away, to establish in their stead what the world will not longer permit to be established, military and political domination by arms, by which to oust where she could not excel the rivals she most feared and hated. The peace we make must remedy that wrong. It must deliver the once fair lands and happy peoples of Belgium and northern France from the Prussian conquest and the Prussian menace, but it must also deliver the peoples of Austria-Hungary, the peoples of the Balkans, and the peoples of Turkey, alike in Europe and in Asia, from the impudent and alien dominion of the Prussian military and commercial autocracy.

We owe it, however, to ourselves to say that we do not wish in any way to impair or to rearrange the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It is no affair of ours what they do with their own life, either industrially or politically. We do not purpose or desire to dictate to them in any way. We only desire to see that their affairs are left in their own hands, in all matters, great or small. We shall hope to secure for the peoples of the Balkan peninsula and for the people of the Turkish Empire the right and opportunity to make their own lives safe, their own fortunes secure against oppression or injustice and from the dictation of foreign courts or parties.

* * * * *

From every point of view, therefore, it has seemed to be my duty to speak these declarations of purpose, to add these specific interpretations to what I took the liberty of saying to the Senate in January. Our entrance into the war has not altered our attitude toward the settlement that must come when it is over. When I said in January that the nations of the world were entitled not only to free pathways upon the sea, but also to assured and unmolested access to those pathways, I was thinking, and I am thinking now, not of the smaller and weaker nations alone, which need our countenance and support, but also of the great and powerful nations, and of our present enemies as well as our present associates in the war. I was thinking, and am thinking now, of Austria herself, among the rest, as well as of Servia and Poland. Justice and equality of rights can be had only at a great price. We are seeking permanent, not temporary, foundations for the peace of the world, and must seek them candidly and fearlessly. As always, the right will prove to be the expedient.

What shall we do, then, to push this great war of freedom and justice to its righteous conclusion? We must clear away with a thorough hand all impediments to success and we must make every adjustment of law that will facilitate the full and free use of our whole capacity and force as a fighting unit.

One very embarrassing obstacle that stands in our way is that we are at war with Germany but not with her allies. I therefore very earnestly recommend that the Congress immediately declare the United States in a state of war with Austria-Hungary. Does it seem strange to you that this should be the conclusion of the argument I have just addressed to you? It is not. It is, in fact, the inevitable logic of what I have said. Austria-Hungary is for the time being not her own mistress but simply the vassal of the German Government. We must face the facts as they are and act upon them without sentiment in this stern business. The Government of Austria-Hungary is not acting upon its own initiative or in response to the wishes and feelings of its own people, but as the instrument of another nation. We must meet its force with our own, and regard the Central Powers as but one. The war can be successfully conducted in no other way. The same logic would lead also to a declaration of war against Turkey and Bulgaria. They also are the tools of Germany. But they are mere tools and do not yet stand in the direct path of our necessary action. We shall go wherever the necessities of this war carry us, but it seems to me that we should go only where immediate and practical considerations lead us and not heed any others.

* * * * *

We can do this [i. e., concentrate upon the prosecution of the war] with all the greater zeal and enthusiasm because we know that for us this is a war of high principle, debased by no selfish ambition of conquest or spoliation; because we know, and all the world knows, that we have been forced into it to save the very institutions we live under from corruption and destruction. The purposes of the Central Powers strike straight at the very heart of everything we believe in; their methods of warfare outrage every principle of humanity and of knightly honor; their intrigue has corrupted the very thought and spirit of many of our people; their sinister and secret diplomacy has sought to take our very territory away from us and disrupt the Union of the States. Our safety would be at an end, our honor forever sullied and brought into contempt were we to permit their triumph. They are striking at the very existence of democracy and liberty.

(To be concluded in the next issue.)

Foreign Press Comment

The Russian Problem

THE following analysis of the Russian political situation is taken from an article in the London *Nation* of August 31, entitled "The Great Russian Maze."

The internal danger to Bolshevik rule comes from two distinct and rival counter-revolutionary groups. One of these, the League of Regeneration, represents the leaders of the Centre and Right of the dissolved Constituent Assembly-Moderate-Evolutionist-Socialists of various shades, and the Radical-Republican Left Wing of the "Cadets." These are all anti-Bolshevik, anti-Romanoff, and anti-German. They look to the Allies to destroy the Bolsheviks, and may be willing, as the price of our aid, to renew war with Germany. Their domestic programme is to restore the Constituent Assembly—a body which was representative in the obsolete conditions of last Autumn. They have a following among the "intellectuals" and the wealthier peasants, but how far they can win the masses is doubtful. On their social policy they are not united. The Cadets will never agree to abolish private property in land, and that is the test issue in Russia. This condition, then, is temporary. It must evolve either to the Left or Right, and shed either its Cadets or its Socialists. The second group is before all else Monarchist. It has for its leader the head of the Church in Moscow, the Patriarch Tikhon, a man of some force of character. It has the Church behind it and many of the big industrial capitalists and some heads of noble houses. It will rally the Right Wing Cadets and Octobrists. Its opinions range from "Black-Hundred" Pan-Slavist reaction to the Liberal-Conservatism of M. Miliukoff. It proposes to restore the dynasty under the Grand Duke Nicholas, and it will summon, not a Constituent Assembly based on manhood suffrage, but the old-world "Zemsky Sobor," an indirectly chosen assembly capable of the desired manipulation by the nobility and the propertied class. Is this group pro-Ally or pro-German? We imagine that it is neither. It is "truly Russian," traditional, self-centred, with no cosmopolitan or international notions, and it will be purely opportunist in its policy. M. Miliukoff, Terestchenko, and Vinaver, the leaders of the "Right Wing" Cadets, are already pro-German. If Berlin will help this movement, it may decide to grasp the helping hand. It wants Czardom again, and whatever London or Paris might do or tolerate, Mr. Wilson is not likely to promote "the King business" in Russia. We imagine that this Monarchist group has laid its plans, and that an attempt at decisive action will not be long delayed. If it should win any measure of success in Moscow, it may conceivably be tempted to secure itself by an understanding with Germany. It represents the same classes and parties which govern there under the Dictator Skoropadsky. What happened in Kieff might happen also in Moscow. There are some indications that Germany would consent to ease the path of a friendly Monarchist Russia by revising the Brest Treaty, and would not object to the reunion of the Ukraine with Great Russia.

If this forecast is correct, then the last chapter of the Allies' dealings with Russia would be a disastrous climax to a long history of blunders. But we hope that the final choice does not yet lie between Bolsheviks and Monarchists. Each has a real following; each stands for an intelligible idea. But the Moderate Socialists are far nearer to the West, much closer in their mentality to the Left groups of England, France, or even of Germany, and to our own notions more sympathetic. Only they fail in their dynamics. They are not men of action. They cannot hold or lead the masses, as the Bolsheviks do or did. Their natural adherents, the "intellectual class," are too small in Russia to govern. If the Bolsheviks have failed, it is not for lack of will or courage or leadership. But they have imposed an unpopular tyranny, and they could not solve the material problem of transport which meant hunger. Nor could their military power cope at once with Germans and Turks, Czecho-Slovaks, Japanese, and Cossacks. If it should turn out that they eventually lose control of Moscow to a Monarchist reaction with some pro-German leanings, because they had to send their best troops to cope with our *protégés*, the Czecho-Slovaks, our political strategy will stand convicted. The true course for us was to have followed Mr. Wilson in a helpful attitude to any *de facto* Government, giving such economic and technical aid as it most required. A friend might have induced the Bolsheviks to prune some of the extravagances of their policy. Its worst phases, as in most revolutions, were its violent response, in the true Jacobin fashion, to danger. But it may not be too late even now to make Russia safe for democracy. Let us limit the sphere of our operations to the coast and avoid bloodshed. Let us withdraw the Czecho-Slovaks—or, better still, send them to Baku to help the Russians against the Turks. Let us renew relations, even if they be informal, with the Soviets. While we give economic aid to the Moderate Government in Archanged, it cannot be sound policy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to assist it directly in prosecuting civil war. The alternative to such a policy must be, we fear, the triumph of a probably pro-German Monarchist movement, and in a form which no efforts of ours will avail to shake. But there is just a chance of a better solution. Our official policy has steadily ignored the claims of the revolution to democratic sympathy. Let us rather endeavor to test what reserves of force lie with the Moderate Republicans. In this way, and this way only, we may possibly avert not merely the destruction of the revolution itself, but the consolidation of German hegemony over wide regions of Russia.

Servia and the Entente

THE *New Europe* (London), in its issue of August 29, prefaces an article on "Servia and the Entente," by "A Group of Servians," with the following editorial comment:

Last week we published a frank survey of the recent course of Servian policy, in the belief that further silence on this delicate subject is contrary to the true interests alike of Servia and of the Entente. We now supplement our own article by a short statement emanating from a group of Servians whose names (if we did not suppress them, for very obvious reasons) would command very general respect and confidence.

We take this occasion of making our own position clear beyond all possibility of misunderstanding. For Servia and the Servian nation we have the highest possible admiration and esteem. The British nation will never forget Servia's heroism and sufferings, and is, we believe, firmly resolved to pay to the full the debt which it owes to her, and which has been unduly augmented by the mistakes of British policy in the past. This war has laid the foundations of an enduring friendship between the two nations which we, for our part, shall do everything in our power to strengthen. But it is just because we value this friendship so highly that we are alarmed at certain recent tendencies in Servian politics, and at the way in which the destinies of so gallant and so democratic a people have gradually been allowed to fall into the hands of a tiny anti-democratic and reactionary clique. For individuals we care nothing, for Servia we care everything; and we protest most energetically against the attempt to identify Servia with any one statesman or party. The Servian Government must recover its representative character if it is to retain the confidence of the Allied Governments. It must have the whole nation behind it, instead of relying on a single narrow group. Above all, there must be an end to the impudent fiction that the Entente's friendship is dependent upon the political fortunes of this or that individual. We have no doubt whatever that the Governments of the Entente fully realize the unity of national purpose which inspires every true Serb, every true Jugoslav, and will, therefore, only give their confidence to a Government which rests upon a *union sacrée* of all national forces, and is resolved to adjure the worn-out methods of a Balkan satrapy.

Austria from Within

THE *New Europe* (London) of August 29 reprints, practically in full, a striking article entitled "Austria from Within," by Friedrich Austerlitz, editor of the Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung*, published in the German-Austrian Socialist monthly *Der Kampf*. The author criticises strongly the reactionary attitude of the Austrian Germans, and argues the case for a "Nationalities-State," which, however, he points out, "is only a higher form of state life if it rests on freedom of the nations and guarantees them national independence within the international connection." Austria "should be able to recognize the trend of the age from the development in Russia." The concluding portion of the article, which follows, is from a translation in the *New Europe* (London).

We should hesitate to adhere to this ideal of a new Austria if it were a serious danger to the German nation in Austria. But an Austria combining free, independent national states in a higher unity is in reality *the most fruitful German policy*, the only policy which would make democratic progress possible for the Austrian Germans. The ideal of the German middle class to-day is to preserve unimpaired all that exists, merely giving it a stronger German tinge. This is an utterly reactionary ideal, and so it is a real dispensation of Providence that these Germans should seek their pattern in the rule of the Magyars over their nationalities and should desire to transplant this to Austrian soil. An absurd idea, to subject the highly-developed Slavs of Austria to such treatment as the Slovaks and Rumanians of Hungary still endure! But the death-knell of the Hungarian pseudo-national state will soon have struck. And a moral idea, to desire dominion over other peoples! The Germans have the choice of uniting all their fragments and endowing them with independence, or of using themselves up in a struggle for the rank of "leading nation," which must fail because contrary to nature. A really creative policy would long ago have led them on to the path towards the autonomous national state; but their adherence to their false national policy simply makes the crisis insoluble. The New Austria cannot be formed against their will, and their will is blind.

The worst fruit of this policy of the German *bourgeoise*—which wants to, but cannot, rule—is that it is necessarily hampered by reactionary reserves. The Germans were once in Austria those who fought for freedom, while the Slavs opposed to them the resistance of the dead mass. To-day, on the contrary, all Slav nations are democratic, while the German *bourgeoisie* is obstinately opposed to democratic progress. A comparison of the political ideology of Czechs and Germans simply puts the latter to shame. It is characteristic enough that the Czechs have given up the old game of "national concessions" and keep one single aim before their eyes, while the Germans make their cause dependent on favor from above. The Czechs have simply ejected the nobility from their nation, and their highest ambition is to rally the whole nation—the working class at its head—beneath the democratic banner; for the Germans the Socialist workman is an outcast, and the "alliance" with the nobility of the Herrenhaus is their pride. For the Czechs and all Slavs universal suffrage is a matter of course; for the Germans it is still a red rag. But it is not a personal difference, for the German citizen and peasant is no less honest a man. But—and this is the saddest of all—the national policy of the Czechs involves democracy, whereas that of the Germans involves privilege. The German middle class, if it wants to be national, must act in an anti-democratic sense; or, if it acts in a democratic sense, it is anti-national. It is a conflict with itself, for the nation which is not democratic robs itself of the possibilities of development. It is astonishing that the German *bourgeoisie* is not conscious of the poverty of its national policy. . . . Reaction flows from its very pores.

Interview With Mr. Troelstra

THE Swiss correspondent of the Amsterdam *Handelsblad* had an interview on August 7 with Mr. Troelstra, the leader of the Dutch Socialist party, who spent a few weeks at Verey, on the Lake of Geneva, on account of his health. Speaking of the treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the outlook for an International Socialist conference, he is quoted as saying:

I regard the peace of Brest-Litovsk as a direct insult to the majority of the German Reichstag who, on June 19, 1917, passed the well-known peace resolution. Neither the German nor the Austrian Socialists have been willing to take the responsibility for the Brest-Litovsk treaty. The Austrians voted against it. The German Socialists refrained from voting at all. From personal interviews with Scheidemann I know that he and his party do not regard this peace settlement as at all definitive. I cannot find words sufficiently strong to protest against this abuse of power on the part of the Central Powers. If the Entente wishes to agitate against the peace of Brest-Litovsk, they will have our full support and sympathy. But I do not believe that anything can be gained by an armed invasion of eastern Siberia or the Murman coast. This merely forces the democratic parties of the Central Powers into the hands of the militarists and the annexationists. If, on the other hand, the Allies were willing to discuss the possibilities of peace upon a basis which would demand an immediate revision of the Brest-Litovsk treaty, they could count upon the support of the Socialists in Germany and Austria; for if the German and Austrian Governments should refuse to accept such a stipulation there would arise such an opposition against them in their own countries that they would be obliged to give in.

The fact that the French Socialists have accepted Longuet's motion tells me that the moment for such an international conference is approaching, and that the time has come for strong political activity on the part of the Socialists everywhere. I believe it to be the duty of the German Socialists to tell the Imperial Government that the party will vote against all war credits until the Reichstag resolution of July 19 shall have been officially accepted by the German Government as her basis for peace. Thus far the German Socialists have been able to ask: "How can we vote against our own Government while the French Socialists back Clemenceau without reserve?" The resolution of Longuet has changed this. The German Socialists have no longer any excuse when they support Hertling, and France has opened the road which will lead to a general peace by way of an international Socialist conference. If the different Governments should refuse permission under such circumstances, they would be opposed by the combined strength of all Socialists everywhere, and even if the conference were forcibly prevented, the old Internationale would find itself once more upon the battleground where Socialism and Imperialism contend for a final decision.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy and Austria

AN editorial on "Italy and the War," by Auguste Gauvain, published in the *Journal des Débats* (Paris) of August 28, having been mutilated by the censor, the author, in the issue of August 30, returns to the subject. A concluding paragraph follows.

The Italian polemic, silence on which is prescribed in France, touches the most sacred interests of the Allies. The most enlightened, clear-seeing and patriotic Italians have come to the conclusion that their country should take a clear-cut position on the question of nationalities and of Austria. They feel, they know, that a Metternich policy would lead to national failure. They want to see Italian diplomacy frankly renounce this policy and enter frankly on the course which France and England, after regrettable tergiversations, have now resolutely entered upon and upon which the United States, also after too long hesitation, is advancing under full sail. It was this latter circumstance, indeed, that induced the *Corriere della Sera* to publish its remarkable series of articles of a fortnight ago. The *Corriere* notes the growing rôle of the United States in the war and foresees that the influence of President Wilson will be strong when it comes to world liquidation, and it knows that the Washington Cabinet is not a party to the famous pact of London of April, 1915, conceived and worded according to the purest Metternich doctrine.

A German Prayer

GERMAN newspapers continue to refer to the indications of moral decline in Germany and to the increasing readiness with which delusions of various sorts are embraced. The recent defeats on the western front call forth the following from the *Reichsbote*, an Evangelical organ:

German people, full of envy must thou regard thy mortal foes, who are being urged on to victory by strong-willed, ardent patriots. Clemenceau sends every traitor and alarmist to the gallows or to penal servitude, but thou dost tolerate openly treason within thy borders and dost suffer systematic depression of the general spirit. Curse all those hyphenated ones, worthy of nothing but death, who, in the sense and also it may be in the service, of our false friends and of our enemies, unceasingly undermine the will of our field-gray warriors to fight and win, and who, out of ugly party infatuation or from manifest hostility to their country, would hinder the rise of Germany to be a world power—our real aim in this war. German people, go into thy churches and pray to thy God that His grace may be full and that He may give thy Kaiser strength to wake our Bismarck from the dead, to renew the spirit of this Hercules, who shall purge Germany's Augean stable, slay the Hydra of dissension, and save his people from faintness of heart, treachery, and ruin.

Anglo-American Understanding

THE following extracts from a letter from ex-President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard to F. C. de Sumichrast appear in the London *Times* of September 9:

It seems to be important that those who discuss a perfect union between the British people and the American people for the war, and after, should clearly understand what the difficulties are which must be overcome. . . .

President Wilson's action towards Mexico has now converted the American people in general to thinking that the American Government should not protect by force the American citizens who make heavy investments on the territory of backward or helpless people. The British, Germans, French, and Dutch have always followed the opposite policy, and Spain and Portugal used to. If the British Empire and the United States are to cooperate to keep the peace of the world when this war ceases, it is essential that they should come to a perfect understanding as to the treatment of backward peoples, and the policy of extending trade and protecting commercial adventurers by force of arms.

I observe that there is a section of British public opinion which resents the idea that great Britain needs help in order to maintain an effective control of the seas in her own interest and in the interests of the world. Americans generally believe that Great Britain cannot do that job alone. They think that for the safety of the democracies Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy, and Japan had better agree on a public statement to the effect that they would keep the seas free for everybody in time of peace, but that there was to be no freedom of the seas for autocratic governments who should go to war, and that neutrals in time of war would be able to deal only with the allied free governments.

It seems to me doubtful whether Great Britain and the United States think alike about the serious questions concerning capital and labor. . . . It is highly desirable that the two nations get together before the war ends with regard to the treatment of the labor question.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

It would contribute greatly to an effective and durable union between Great Britain and the United States if the two Governments could settle on the same general principles with regard to customs and excise duties. I am not enough of an international economist to know whether the war is likely to bring British and American opinion together on the subject of free trade. Both countries will need to raise the largest possible revenue for many years; but thus much one may confidently affirm—there is a chance for a clash between Great Britain and the United States on tariffs and preferentials. . . .

Resignation of Feng Kuo-Chang

THE *North China Herald* (Shanghai, August 27) publishes the following "summarized translation" of the circular telegram of President Feng Kuo-Chang, sent to all the provinces on August 31, announcing his resignation.

I have now served the Republic for seven years. During that period I have encountered disturbances and difficulties. The situation was once so critical that it was only by the united efforts of the Premier and the Tuchuns that the Republic was restored. I was compelled to assume the highest office by President Li insisting upon retiring and by all parties urging me to remember my duty, as dictated by the Provisional Constitution, although I knew myself even then to be incompetent. My only object has been to attain unity and peace in the Republic. But neither unity nor peace is attainable. These two things are as elusive as a bubble. After vain attempt on my part for over a year, I must hold myself blameable. As our ancient saying has it—mere good intention or good law can accomplish nothing; we must have the right man to back it up. I feel myself dreadfully short in many ways. Our soldiers remain still exposed and our people are still in distress. In spite of the fact that I have had the support of good and able Ministers and loyal and brave brothers, I have failed to lead them to the right goal. For the sake of national welfare and people's happiness, the only thing for me to do is to retire from my post in favor of a more competent man. Now my tenure of office is nearing its end, and Parliament is about to open its session, I hope the members will, as dictated by their conscience, elect one who is possessed both of wisdom and of virtue and who will be able to restore peace in the Republic. If the spirit of the Provisional Constitution is obeyed, the foundation of our nation will soon be consolidated. My sentiment must be appreciated by heaven and earth. My only prayer is for the good of our nation and people. I have no other wish except the wish to witness an early assembly of Parliament and the speedy settlement of the country. I have not the least wish to be elected President, nor do I entertain any desire for power and profit.

Reprisals

CONSIDERABLE apprehension has been awakened in the *Daily Mail* (London, September 5) lest the Germans, in their retreat, should make havoc of towns in Northern France and Belgium which have hitherto been unscathed. "The Allies," it declares,

should unitedly inform Germany, in words which will admit of no miunderstanding and which cannot at a later day be subject to misinterpretation or change, that, if Germany practices sheer vandalism by razing Lille to the ground and venting German spite by wanton destruction, before peace is signed or as an inevitable and irrevocable part of such peace as may be entered into, the city of Hamburg or Cologne, or, if need be, Berlin, shall be first evacuated and then so destroyed that not one stone of it shall be left upon another.

This suggestion is supported by Sir William Bull, M.P., who proposes that certain towns should be earmarked for such reprisals. Thus, if Brussels is razed to the ground, Berlin shall be similarly dealt with. Essen might be named as the "opposite number" to Liège, and Hamburg to Antwerp. The wealthier towns in Germ ny should be dealt with first. Their inhabitants, "when they see what we are aiming at, will soon bring pressure to bear which ought to be effectual."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

GREAT BRITAIN'S future economic policy has been made the subject of a circular letter which has been sent to all the leading industrial and commercial firms in the United Kingdom by the British Commonwealth Union, recently organized under the trusteeship of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Lord Desborough, and Sir Lionel Phillips, for the promotion of British commerce. The programme of the Union sets forth that "the policy of the State in relation to industry and commerce after the war should be to afford the maximum of assistance in their maintenance and development, and to interfere as little as possible with their control and management." For the attainment of that end, the Union urges a vigorous prosecution of the war, Imperial preference, restriction of the importation of enemy manufactured goods for as long a period as may be desirable after the war, the establishment and maintenance under British control of essential "key" industries, together with a complete power of tariff bargaining, the organization of raw material within the Empire for the primary benefit of the component parts of the Empire, and strict naturalization laws. The general policy of the Paris Economic Conference is also indorsed. The programme expresses opposition to state intervention in industrial disputes, at the same time that it commends public health, housing, and educational reforms as essential parts of a sound economic policy.

STEPS are being taken to extend throughout the United States the membership of the "English-Speaking Union," an organization formed in London on July 4, 1918, to promote "a good understanding between the peoples of the British Commonwealth and the United States of America." The immediate objects of the Union are to encourage locally every movement which makes for the friendship of the English-speaking peoples; to welcome in Great Britain and the British Dominions visitors from the United States, and in the latter country to make the British subject feel equally at home; to celebrate the national festivals of both countries; to arrange visits, lectures. sporting contests, and an exchange of professors and preachers, and in general to increase mutual understanding. It is also proposed to publish a magazine devoted to the same purpose.

AN examination of the reconstruction resolutions recently adopted by the National Socialist party in England shows some radical points of divergence from the programme of the British Labor party, with which the Socialists have lately decided to affiliate. The resolutions call upon labor and Socialist organizations to combine in preventing industries now controlled and managed by the Government from passing again into private hands. Pending the abolition of the wages system, a national minimum wage "based on a high standard of life" is demanded, but any reduction of present wage scales is specifically opposed. The Government is urged to make use of the coöperative movement in production and distribution, and to support temporarily, "at a good living wage," returned soldiers, and all persons who may be unemployed as the result of industrial readjustments following the war. Other resolutions demand state expropriation of "all suitable waste lands, private pleasure lands, and insufficiently tilled lands" for productive purposes; transportation of agricultural or industrial material free of charge; Government housing for workers; acquisition by the state of "all private town houses now occupied" that "might be adapted to the uses of the workers, and all large private buildings not open to the public which might be used for communal purposes"; secular education for children between the ages of 5 and 19; maternity benefits until the age of five; State control of hospitals, infirmaries, and convalescent homes, and the establishment of the medical profession as a department of State.

THE publication of the Montagu report on governmental reforms in India has revived the discussion, carried on intermittently for a number of years, of Indian colonization of Africa. Sir Theodore Morison, who has had much administrative experience in India, and, more recently, in German East Africa since the British occupation, has urged that East Africa be assigned to India as a colony: a step which, as the *Spectator* points out, would "give to the Government of India a greater power of control in Africa than in India itself." The African negro, he declares, in a letter to the London *Times*, "would gain enormously by association with Indians, especially with Indian cultivators and artisans," and "will learn more and to better purpose from them than from the white man." The Aga Khan, in a recent book entitled "India in Transition," proposes that both British and German East Africa be placed under the administrative control of the India Government as a field for Indian immigration. The *Times*, while recognizing that the future of German East Africa must be determined by the peace conference, points out that the primary need of India is a better distribution of its population rather than a new outlet overseas, and that it is not clear that the people of India ought to be entrusted with the difficult task of colonization just at the time when they are being given, by the Montagu proposals, a largely increased share in the management of their own political affairs. The discussion is significant as indicating a possible disposition on the part of India to claim equal rights with other parts of the Empire in any new territories that may be opened to colonization after the war.

AT a recent conference held at Stratford, England, the National Socialist party, which was formed in 1916 as a protest against the anti-war policy of the British Socialist party, announced its decision to affiliate with the Labor party. The executive committee reported that this decision had been unanimously endorsed by the party branches in order that the presence of the National Socialists might serve to "uphold the pro-Ally point of view against the strange mixture of pacifism and Bolshevism which seemed to be in a fair way to dominate the Labor party." The National Socialist party does not, apparently, intend to lose its identity, but will form a pro-Ally bloc in the Labor party. Mr. H. M. Hyndman, who discussed the formation of a league of nations, urged that until the German nation had altered its character it would not be safe to enter into any arrangement with it. A league of nations already existed, he said, in the Entente Powers, and it was well to begin with those who could be trusted. A resolution was adopted declaring that no definite decision on the subject of a league of nations was possible or desirable until the German armies and military system were defeated in the field and the question of a league had been more thoroughly discussed and investigated.

THE appointment of Sir Charles Eliot as British High Commissioner for Siberia, with headquarters at Vladivostok, is in harmony with the earlier appointment of a High Commissioner for Northern Russia, with headquarters at Archangel. The new High Commissioner was for some time Commissioner and Commander-in-Chief of the East African Protectorate. He had previously served with distinction in the diplomatic service at Petrograd, Constantinople, and Washington, and represented Great Britain on the International Commission appointed to adjust the Samoan controversy. Following his resignation of the East African post, in 1904, he was Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield University and first Principal of Hongkong University. The political and commercial policy of Great Britain in Siberia will, it is thought, follow his recommendations.

THE British War Office, which for some time has been issuing a *Daily Review of the Foreign Press*, together with a weekly supplement dealing with the neutral press, has now added fortnightly economic and reconstruction supplements. The economic supplement deals with trade and commerce, railways and shipping, banking and finance, labor conditions, social and economic policy and legislation, and similar matters. The reconstruction supplement describes the measures being taken or suggested in Germany and elsewhere in connection with the return to peace conditions. Half-yearly indexes to the new supplements are also promised.

THE future conduct of the scientific work hitherto carried on by international organizations acting under international agreements is to be discussed at a conference to be held on October 9, at Burlington House, London. The conference, which is called at the invitation of the British Royal Society, will be composed of delegates from the Allied nations, representing the academies of Paris, Rome, Tokio, and Washington, together with representatives nominated by the Governments of Belgium, Portugal and Servia. The Council of the Royal Society has submitted for discussion the question of the desirability of establishing among the Allied nations some form of organization for scientific coöperation, and the relation of the various Governments towards those organizations which have hitherto received their support.

THE *Temps* (Paris), August 3, quotes Count Czernin as saying, in a speech in the Austrian House of Lords on July 15: "I make no demand that the German war aims should be communicated to us. I only hope with all my heart that the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Baron Burian) knows them, that they are as formerly of a purely defensive nature, and that the defensive character of the war has been completely maintained. The people of Austria would not understand that we ought to prolong the war on account of the desires of a foreign state for conquest."

IN an interview between the Italian Premier, Signor Orlando, and the members of a committee of Rumanian Irredenti which has recently been formed in Italy, the president of the committee, Professor Mandrescu, after assuring the Premier that the Rumani-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ans "would never forget their origin and that nothing could sunder the links which bound them to the Italian people," called attention to the fact that Signor Orlando "had given his consent to the formation of a committee of a number of intellectual Rumanians from Transylvania, the Banat and Bukovina, which should be the mouthpiece for the Rumanians of Austria-Hungary"; and that although Rumania was "out of the war," Rumanians would still be found fighting on the side of the Allies. Signor Orlando, in reply, declared that Italy "had the strongest sympathy" for the Rumanian people, and that the Government "was determined to continue its policy in favor of the oppressed nationalities." According to the *Christian Science Monitor*, which publishes in its issue of September 18 a letter on the subject from its Rome correspondent, Professor Mandrescu, in a subsequent interview, stated that the committee would endeavor to form a Rumanian legion, develop propaganda, and cultivate Italo-Rumanian relations. An Italo-Rumanian newspaper is also shortly to be established, and Rumania, it is hoped, will be represented in the forthcoming Congress of Oppressed Nationalities at Paris.

A CONFERENCE of American and German delegates, appointed to arrange for the exchange of military and civil prisoners, opened at Berne on September 23, and is expected to continue for several weeks. The American delegates include, among others, John W. Garland, Minister to the Netherlands; John W. Davis, recently appointed Ambassador to Great Britain, and Major James H. Perkins, formerly Commissioner-General of the American Red Cross for Europe, whose resignation of that position to accept a staff appointment in the American Expeditionary Forces was announced on September 24. The head of the German delegation is Prince Ernst Hohenlohe-Langenburg, at one time President of the Reichstag. The proceedings of the conference will be secret, but a public statement of the arrangements arrived at will, it is said, be issued by the Department of State upon the conclusion of the sessions.

TWO missions, both representing the American Federation of Labor, are now in Europe for the purpose of conferring with labor leaders. The first, headed by Samuel Gompers, sailed for England late in August. Its object, according to a statement issued by the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, was "to oppose the radicals under Arthur Henderson, and the Socialists desiring immediate peace." Mr. Gompers, it was added, "will oppose the propaganda of the Liebknecht Socialists of Germany and all other radical elements in Europe favoring a speedy compromise peace with Germany." The other members of the mission are William J. Bowen, president of the International Bricklayers' and Plasterers' Union; John T. Frey, president of the International Moulders' Union; Edgar Wallace, editor of the *United Mine Workers' Journal*; C. L. Paine, president of the International Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, and Guy H. Oyster, secretary. The party arrived in England on August 29, and attended the British Trades Union Congress, September 2-6, at Derby. Mr. Gompers and his associates were conspicuous at the meeting of the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference in London, called at Mr. Gompers's suggestion for September 16-18. The second mission left the United States in August. James Wilson, president of the Patternmakers' League of America, who headed a labor mission to Europe in April and May, is the chairman, the other members being F. J. McNulty, president of the Electrical Workers' International Union; John Golden, president of the United Textile Workers of America; Michael Green, president of the United Hatters of America, and Peter Josephine, a member of the Granite Cutters' Union. The plans of this mission are reported to be "similar" to those of the group headed by Mr. Gompers. Its arrival in Italy was announced on September 17, but of its doings in the interval before that date no information appears to have been made public.

THE provisional Government of Esthonia, acting through its diplomatic representative at London, has presented a formal protest to Great Britain against the oppressive conduct of Germany. Mr. Balfour, in reply, declared that Great Britain could not recognize the right of Germany to exercise any control over Esthonia, that no peace which recognized such right would be satisfactory to Great Britain, and that the principle of self-determination was to be recognized as applying to the province. The precise application of the principle, however, must be left to the consideration of the peace conference.

AS a result of the Dutch elections held on July 3, the balance of power in Parliament has swung from the Left to the Right, the various parties voting with the Left losing seventeen seats while the Right gained seven. This is the first time since 1848 that the Liberals have definitely lost control of Parliament. An analysis of the voting strength of the parties of the Left in the present Parliament gives the Union Liberals 6 seats, the Independent Liberals 4, the Democrats 5, and the Socialists (Social Democratic Laborers' party) 22. The total vote of the Right is 56, of which the Roman Catholics have 30, Anti-Revolutionary party (Conservatives) 13, the Christian Historical party 7, the Christian Social party 1, the Christian Socialists 1, and the Christian Democrats 1. Of several new parties which were formed before the election only two, the Economic Association and the Social Democratic party, showed any appreciable strength, each securing 3 seats. These, with the one representative of the Middle Class party, will vote with the Left. The Neutral party) the Country Districts party (Farmers' League), and the Preparedness party, with one seat each, will vote with the Right. The popularity of Dr. M. W. F. Treub, Minister of Finance since February, 1917, and leader of the Economic Association, caused him to be elected by large majorities. Following the election several political leaders were asked to form a Cabinet, among them Monsigneur Nolens, head of the Roman Catholic party. One of the chief obstacles to the formation of a Government appears to have been the refusal of the Socialists to agree to a coalition with the Right. According to the latest reports, a Cabinet representing the Right has finally been formed by Jonkheer Ruys de Beerenbrouck, a man of untried political strength, who holds the portfolio of Minister of the Interior in addition to that of President of the Council of Ministers. The other members are Jonkheer van Karnebeek, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Theodore Heemskerk, Minister of Justice; Jonkheer Alting van Geusau, Minister of War and Marine; Mr. de Vries, Minister of Finance; Mr. van Ysselsteyn, Minister of Agriculture; Professor Aalberse, Minister of Labor and Social Legislation; Dr. de Visser, Minister of Education, Arts, and Sciences; Mr. Idenburg, Minister of Colonies. The Ministry of Public Works has not yet been filled.

AN international conference, called with the object of forming a Pan-American Federation of Labor, is to be held at Laredo and Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, on November 13. Delegates from a number of Central and South American countries, as well as from Mexico and the United States, are expected to participate. The American Federation of Labor, which has recently sent a labor mission to Mexico, is one of the promoters of the conference.

A NEW Norwegian review, *Atlantis*, edited by Prof. Chr. Collin, of Christiania University, has been begun with the object of bringing Norway into closer touch with the peoples of Western Europe. Articles will, apparently, be published in French and English as well as in Norwegian. Among the contributors to the first number is Maurice Barrès.

ON several occasions during the past year Peru has been reported to be on the eve of declaring war against Germany. Action taken by the Chamber of Deputies on September 14, however, seems to make such a declaration unlikely. The Chamber, after rejecting by a large majority a resolution for a declaration of war, adopted a motion, offered by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, declaring that the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany, October 5, 1917, together with subsequent acts "altering the neutral policy of the country," "define the international situation of Peru in the present war"; and that this position, "in the event of no new circumstances," should be adhered to.

HE creation in France of a post-war Ministry charged with wide functions in the rebuilding of the nation has been advocated by Edouard Herriot, major of Lyons and senator of the Rhone Department. In a statement made to the Paris representative of the *Christian Science Monitor*, M. Herriot urged the necessity of developing for France a large occidental market to counter-balance the German market. A special Ministry in Germany, constituted by Imperial decree, is already considering the social and political problems to follow the war. To displace Germany in the economic field, which, he said, was indispensable to insure real victory, France and her Allies must be better organized than Germany. Among the functions of a post-war Ministry in France M. Herriot includes "all the essential interests of the nation," among them the exploitation of the natural resources of the country, the organization of transportation, industry, and commerce, reform of the banking system, educational reform, and "last but not least, the creation of a new status for women."

AN agricultural mission from the United States, composed of specialists in dry farming and irrigation, is reported to have arrived in Algiers on September 8. The object of the mission is said to be to study the possibility of producing crops on the semi-sterile high ground of southern Algeria. The New York *Evening Post*, to which we are indebted for the foregoing facts, adds that "according to private information, the mission desires to obtain a concession to more than four million acres for cultivation by American methods and with American implements."

THE valuable "Record of Current Events," compiled by Horace M. Kallen and Edward M. Sait, and published as a supplement to the September number of the *Political Science Quarterly*, covers the period from August 1, 1917, to July 31, 1918.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are Appleton Books

Published by D. Appleton & Company, 35 West 32nd Street, New York, and for sale at all Bookstores

RECENT AND FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE and DRAMA

THE WRITING AND READING OF VERSE
By CLARENCE EDWARD ANDREWS.
The forms of English verse, how metrical and emotional effects are obtained, vers libre, old French forms, etc. $2.00 *net.*

A BOOK OF SHORT STORIES
By BLANCHE COLTON WILLIAMS.
Thirteen stories, chronologically arranged with criticisms of style and construction and literary position of the authors. $1.00 *Educ. net.*

CHILDREN'S PLAYS
By ADA M. SKINNER.
Brief plays for children of ten to twelve years to perform themselves. *Illus.* $1.00 *Educ. net.*

FRENCH IN TWENTY LESSONS

SPANISH IN TWENTY LESSONS
The famous Cortina language books are now available, bound in separate parts. Five parts of four chapters each, bound in flexible linen, convenient for carrying in the pocket or shopping bag. The parts are not sold separately. *Each book,* $3.00 *net.*

POPULAR SCIENCE

THE AMATEUR MECHANIC
By A. FREDERICK COLLINS.
How to make, use, operate and repair machines. Over 100 illustrations. $1.10 *net.*

GAS, GASOLINE, AND OIL ENGINES
By A. FREDERICK COLLINS.
How engines are made, how to operate and repair them. *Illus.* $1.10 *net.*

MEDICINE and SURGERY

GUN SHOT FRACTURES
By JOSEPH A. BLAKE, M.D.
By subscription only. Probably $2.50 *net.*

MEDICAL AND SURGICAL THERAPY (The Collection Horizon)
Edited by SURGEON GENERAL SIR ALFRED KEOGH, K. C. B., M. D.
Five volumes, cloth. 8*vo*, $30.00 *net.*

SURGERY OF THE SPINE AND SPINAL CORD
By CHARLES H. FRAZIER, M. D.
8*vo, cloth,* $8.00 *net.*

DIETOTHERAPY
Edited by MAJOR W. E. FITCH, M. R. C., U. S. A.
A practical presentation of the physiology of digestion and the application of diet in health and disease.
Three volumes. 8*vo, cloth.* $21.00 *net.*

PEDAGOGY

BOOKKEEPING AND ACCOUNTING
By JOSEPH J. KLEIN.
An advanced course. $1.75 *Educ. net.*

AN ELEMENTARY COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY
By CYRUS C. ADAMS.
New Revised Edition. $1.20 *Educ. net.*

OUR WINTER BIRDS
By FRANK M. CHAPMAN.
An introduction to the study of birds. School edition. 45c. *Educ. net.*

SPANISH

HISTORIA DE LA AMERICA LATINA
By ENRIQUEZ SANTIBANEZ. $1.50 *net.*

EN EL PAIS DEL SOL
By JOSE J. TABLADA. 60 *cents net.*

AL ASALTO! (Over the Top!)
By ARTHUR GUY EMPEY. $2.00 *net.*

MIS CUATRO ANOS EN ALEMANIA (My Four Years in Germany)
By JAMES W. GERARD. $2.50 *net.*

FICTION

THE LAST REBEL
By JOSEPH A. ALTSHELER.
How youth and love conquered an old bitterness. $1.25 *net.*

THE PAPER CAP
By AMELIA E. BARR.
A romance of the industrial revolution in England. $1.50 *net.*

THE WINE OF ASTONISHMENT
By MARY HASTINGS BRADLEY.
Love vs. money with the war as an intermediary. $1.50 *net.*

MINNIGLEN
By AGNES and EGERTON CASTLE.
How the war reunited a young Scotchman and his English bride. $1.50 *net.*

THE LAUGHING GIRL
By ROBERT W. CHAMBERS
A satire on the mad-house situation in Switzerland where intrigues are born and die over night. Brisk, breezy, romantic. Not previously published serially. *Illus.* $1.50 *net.*

THE GOLDEN BOUGH
By GEORGE GIBBS.
How a young American and a girl outwitted the German secret service. *Illus.* $1.50 *net.*

THE BLACK OPAL
By MAXWELL GRAY.
How a girl who sinned won redemption. *Illus.* $1.50 *net.*

FICTION

"SHAVINGS"—A Novel
By JOSEPH C. LINCOLN.
Fun, sentiment and romance on Cape Cod. *Illus.* $1.50 *net.*

THE THREE STRINGS
By NATALIE SUMNE LINCOLN.
A murder mystery with international complications. *Illus.* $1.50 *net.*

UNCLE ABNER, MASTER OF MYSTERIES
By MELVILLE DAVISSON POST.
The exploits of an old Virginian who solves baffling mysteries in an amazing fashion. $1.50 *net.*

A DAUGHTER OF JEHU
By LAURA E. RICHARDS.
Kitty Ross and her livery stable and why she ran it. *Illus.* $1.50 *net.*

THE TIME SPIRIT
By J. C. SNAITH.
How an English actress surmounted the social barriers that blocked her path to happiness. *Illus.* $1.50 *net.*

JIMMIE THE SIXTH
By FRANCES R. STERRETT.
The adventures of a "man dressmaker" who went to war. $1.50 *net.*

JUVENILES

THE MASTERS OF THE PEAKS
By JOSEPH A. ALTSHELER.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

THE LOST HUNTERS
By JOSEPH A. ALTSHELER.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

FOR THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS
By RALPH HENRY BARBOUR.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

THE BOY SCOUTS YEARBOOK
Illus. 8*vo.* $2.00 *net.*

CLYDE CORNERS
By ELLEN DOUGLAS DELAND.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

RUNNING FOX
By ELMER RUSSELL GREGOR.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

FIGHTING FOR FAIRVIEW
By WILLIAM HEYLIGER.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

JIMMY MAY IN THE FIGHTING LINE
By CHARLES TENNY JACKSON.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

CAPTAIN TED
By LOUIS PENDLETON.
Illus. $1.35 *net.*

FIGHTERS YOUNG AMERICANS WANT TO KNOW
By EVERETT T. TOMLINSON.
Illus. $1.60 *net.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED